

Historic, Archive Document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.

Reserve
aKF1681
.A25N5
1990

AD-33 Bookplate
(1-68)

NATIONAL

**A
G
R
I
C
U
L
T
U
R
A
L**



LIBRARY

1990 Farm Bill

Side-by-Side
Comparison
of
Administration's "Green Book"
Proposals
and
House (H.R.3950)
Senate (S.2830)
Farm Bills
As Amended by Floor Action

September 1990



Commodity and Conservation Provisions Side-By-Side

Document Delivery Services Branch
USDA, National Agricultural Library
Nat Bldg.
10301 Baltimore Blvd.
Beltsville, MD 20705-2351

NOTICE

This document represents the current status of the commodity and conservation provisions of the 1990 Farm Bill as approved by the House on August 1, 1990 (327 ayes and 91 noes), and Senate on July 27, 1990 (70 yeas and 21 nays), compared with the Administration's "Green Book" proposal. Amendments adopted during floor debate are incorporated in SMALL CAPS. Since farm bill deliberation is a very dynamic process, the reader should exercise caution. Specific provisions are subject to change as both House and Senate bills move through conference. This document will be updated as significant events occur.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
<u>PART I: COMMODITY PROGRAM PROVISIONS</u>	
1) Planting Flexibility.....	1
2) Farm-Level Examples of House and Senate Flexibility Proposals.....	5
3) Farm-Level Examples of Administration Flexibility Proposal.....	8
4) Acreage Reduction Programs (ARP).....	10
5) Paid Land Diversion	13
6) Loan Rates.....	14
7) Oilseed Marketing Loans.....	23
8) Upland Cotton Marketing Loans.....	24
9) Target Prices.....	26
10) Deficiency Payment Rates.....	27
11) Crop Acreage Bases (CAB's).....	29
12) Program Payment Yields.....	30
13) Haying and Grazing.....	31
14) Cross Compliance.....	31
15) Food Security Wheat Reserve.....	31
16) Minimum CCC Sales Policy.....	32
17) Farmer-Owned Reserve (FOR).....	33
18) Commodity Certificates.....	34
19) Payment Limitations.....	36
20) Wool and Mohair Provisions.....	40
21) Sugar Program Provisions.....	40
22) Honey Program Provisions.....	44
23) Dairy Program Provisions.....	46
24) Peanut Program Provisions.....	54
25) Pilot Voluntary Production Limitation Program.....	57
26) Options Pilot Program.....	59
27) Administrative Appeals.....	60
28) Commodity-Related Studies Required by the Secretary.....	64
<u>PART II: CONSERVATION PROVISIONS</u>	
29) Conservation Reserve Program.....	71
30) Wetland Reserve Program.....	77
31) Water Quality Program.....	80
32) Integrated Farm/Crop Management Program.....	84
33) Swampbuster Provisions	89
34) Conservation Compliance Provisions.....	91
35) Multi-Year Set Aside.....	93
36) Natural Resources Loan Program.....	93
37) Record Keeping for Pesticides.....	94
38) Miscellaneous Conservation Provisions.....	96

COMMODITIES AND CONSERVATION
TABLE OF CONTENTS
WITH HOUSE AND SENATE SECTION NUMBERS

1. Planting Flexibility
H. Sec. 1131, as well as individual commodity titles--H. 101, 301, 901, and 1001.
S. Sec. 1001, as well as individual commodity titles--S. 301, 401, 501, and 601.
2. Farm-Level Examples of House and Senate Flexibility Proposals
Examples only
3. Farm-Level Examples of Administration Flexilibility Proposals
Examples only
4. Acreage Reduction Programs (ARP)
H. Sec. 101, 107, 301, 901, 1001, 1122
S. Sec. 301, 401, 501, 506, 601
5. Paid Land Diversion
H. Sec. H. 101, 301, 901, 1001
S. Sec. 301, 401, 501, 601
6. Loan Rates
H. Sec. 101, 107, 301, 901, 1001
S. Sec. 301, 401, 501, 506, 601
7. Oilseed Marketing Loans
H. Sec. 701
S. Sec. 801
8. Upland Cotton Marketing Loans
H. Sec. 101
S. Sec. 501
9. Target Prices
H. Sec. 101, 107, 301, 901, 1001
S. Sec. 301, 401, 501, 506, 601
10. Deficiency Payment Rates
H. Sec. 101, 107, 301, 901, 1001
S. Sec. 301, 401, 501, 506, 601, 1012
11. Crop Acreage Bases
H. Sec. 101, 107, 301, 901, 1001, 1131
S. Sec. 301, 401, 501, 506, 601, 1001
12. Program Payment Yields
H. Sec. 101, 301, 901, 1001, 1131
S. Sec. 301, 401, 501, 601, 1001
13. Haying and Grazing
H. Sec. 101,301,901,1001
S. Sec. 301,401,501,601

14. Cross Compliance
 - H. Sec. 101, 107, 301, 901, 1001
 - S. Sec. 301, 401, 501, 506, 601
15. Food Security Wheat Reserve
 - H. Sec. 1109
 - S. Sec. 1020
16. Minimum CCC Sales Policy
 - H. Sec. 103, 1104, 1116
 - S. Sec. 1016
17. Farmer-Owned Reserve
 - H. Sec. 1116
 - S. Sec. 1029
18. Commodity Certificates
 - H. Sec. 1117, 1118
 - S. Sec. 1015
19. Payment Limitations
 - H. Sec. 1101, 1102
 - S. Sec. 1011
20. Wool and Mohair Provisions
 - H. Sec. 501, 503
 - S. Sec. 201
21. Sugar Program Provisions
 - H. Sec. 201, 202, 203, 204, 207
 - S. Sec. 901
22. Honey Program Provisions
 - H. Sec. 603
 - S. Sec. 2041
23. Dairy Program Provisions
 - H. Sec. 402, 403, 404, 405, 407, 409, 411-413, 415-417
 - S. Sec. 102-104, 106, 108, 110, 111, 113-116, 118-119, 121-138
24. Peanut Program Provisions
 - H. Sec. 802-804
 - S. Sec. 702-704, 706
25. Pilot Voluntary Prod. Limitation Program
 - S. Sec. 301 and 401
26. Options Pilot Program
 - S. Sec. 1051-1056

27. Administrative Appeals
S. Sec. 1032

28. Commodity-Related Studies Required by the Secretary
H. Sec. 1119, 1120
S. Sec. 117, 401, 1031, 1124-1125, 1977, 1980-1992

CONSERVATION PROVISIONS

29. Conservation Reserve Program
H. Sec. 1601, 1603, 1604, 1608
S. Sec. 1211-1216, 1218, 1220-1221, 1237, 1286

30. Wetland Reserve Program
H. Sec. 1608
S. Sec. 1223

31. Water Quality Program
H. Sec. 1372-1376, 1607
S. Sec. 1224

32. Integrated Farm/Crop Management Program
H. Sec. 1611
S. Sec. 1284

33. Swampbuster Provisions
H. Sec. 1603
S. Sec. 1286

34. Conservation Compliance Provisions
H. Sec. 1601, 1603, 1609
S. Sec. 1220, 1232-1235, 1238

35. Multi-Year Set Aside
H. Sec. 1106
S. Sec. 301, 401, 501, 601, 1018, 1091

36. Natural Resources Loan Program
H. Sec. 1605

37. Record Keeping for Pesticides
H. Sec. 1371
S. Sec. 1283

38. Misc. Conservation Provisions
H. Sec. 1120, 1122, 1376, 1384, 1393, 1601, 1605-1606, 1610, 1612-1618
S. Sec. 1236, 1241, 1251-1254, 1261-1278, 1281-1282, 1285, 1287, 12901435-1448

PART I: COMMODITY PROGRAM PROVISIONS



**U.S. Department of Agriculture
Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service**

September 5, 1990

SUMMARY OF AMENDMENTS ADOPTED FOR THE 1990 FARM BILL

PART I: COMMODITY PROGRAMS

Date	HSE/SEN	Topic	Description	Item	Page
7/19/90	Senate	Planting Flexibility	Eliminate minor oilseed plantings on 50/92 acreage.	10	4
7/19/90	Senate	Planting Flexibility	Exclude underplantings for cotton and rice when determining increased ARP under TOP	10	4
7/19/90	Senate	Loan Rates	Change timing of advance compensation payments	21	14
7/19/90	Senate	Oilseed Marketing Loans	Change stocks/use trigger for oilseed marketing loan	25	23
7/19/90	Senate	CCC Sales Policy	Minimum CCC sales price policy for upland cotton, and competitive bid basis for CCC sales	41	32
7/19/90	Senate	Payment Limitations	Determining hybrid seed growers as actively engaged in farming	49	37
7/19/90	Senate	Commodity-Related Studies	Barley feed value determination study	109	66
7/19/90	Senate	Acreage Reduction Programs	Changes the cost share for perennial cover of ACR from 50% to 25%.	17	11
7/19/90	Senate	Options Pilot Program	Reauthorizes the Options Pilot Program for the 1991-1995 crops of corn, and the 1993-1995 crops of wheat and soybeans.	99	59
7/20/90	Senate	Farmer-Owned Reserve	FOR storage rates	42	33
7/24/90	Senate	Planting Flexibility	Prohibits certain fruits and vegetables (including potatoes and edible beans) from being eligible for flexibility provisions.	2	1
7/24/90	Senate	Honey	Directs the Secretary to phase out the honey support provisions over a four-year period.	62	44

SUMMARY OF AMENDMENTS ADOPTED FOR THE 1990 FARM BILL

PART I: COMMODITY PROGRAMS

Date	HSE/SEN	Topic	Description	Item	Page
7/24/90	House	Planting Flexibility	Removes Secretarial discretion to allow minor oilseed planting on cotton and rice 50/92 acres. A similar amendment for wheat and feed grain 0/92 acres was adopted 7/25/90.	10	4
7/24/90	House	Haying and Grazing	Prohibits Secretary from excluding irrigated and irrigable acres not in alfalfa from emergency haying and grazing.	38	31
7/24/90	House	Cross Compliance	Includes language for ELS cotton similar to that for the other crops prohibiting limited and offsetting compliance, and base building of other program crops if participating in the ELS program.	39	31
7/24/90	House	Sugar	Revises the method of calculating acreage base for sugar producers from a weighted 5-year moving average (with the lowest weight for the most recent year, and vice versa), to a simple 5-year moving average (with equal weights for each year).	59	42
7/24/90	House	Dairy	Replaces requirement for a study of State dairy make allowances with a prohibition of any State establishing a dairy make allowance greater than that established under Federal programs.	72	49
7/24/90	Senate	Payment Limitations	Provides for a 20-year limit on irrevocable trusts to be considered a separate person for payment purposes; revises minimal beneficial interest down to 5%; requires the Secretary to develop a database on payments in excess of \$50,000 and to report violations of payment limitations in an annual report to Congress.	50 52	38 39
7/24/90	Senate	Commodity-Related Studies	Requires a study of the impacts of increasing minimum loan rates for the 1992-1995 program crops.	110	66

SUMMARY OF AMENDMENTS ADOPTED FOR THE 1990 FARM BILL

PART I: COMMODITY PROGRAMS

Date	HSE/SEN	Topic	Description	Item	Page
7/25/90	Senate	Dairy	Allows the Secretary to enter into contracts to sell live dairy cattle for export.	71	48
7/25/90	Senate	Commodity-Related Studies	Requires the Secretary to study the impact of durum wheat imports from Canada.	111	67
7/25/90	Senate	Commodity-Related Studies	Requires the Secretary to study the impact of alfalfa seed imports from Canada.	112	67
7/25/90	Senate	Oilseed Marketing Loans	Requires the Secretary to ensure the oilseed marketing loan program is operated in such a way as to minimize stock accumulation and CCC outlays.	25	23
7/25/90	Senate	Deficiency Payments	Declares any provision relating to the recalculation of barley deficiency payments for the 1988 and 1989 crops be considered nondiscretionary.	31	27
7/25/90	House	Dairy	Reduces the level of dairy surpluses that trigger implementation of an inventory management program from 7 to 6 billion pounds.	71	48
7/25/90	House	Loan Rates & ARPs	Increases the discretionary adjustment in loan rates to maintain the competitive position of the United States from 5% to 10%; and adds an additional stocks/use range for determining ARPs for feed grains.	21 12	14 10
7/25/90	House	Loan Rates & Haying and Grazing	Establishes a minimum loan rate for wheat and feed grains; and prohibits the Secretary from excluding irrigated land not seeded in alfalfa from emergency haying and grazing.	21 38	14 31

SUMMARY OF AMENDMENTS ADOPTED FOR THE 1990 FARM BILL

PART I: COMMODITY PROGRAMS

Date	HSE/SEN	Topic	Description	Item	Page
7/25/90	House	Program Payment Yields	Requires the Secretary to accept, at the producer's discretion, actual yields for the 1986-1990 crops of feed grains, excluding the high and low years, in establishing program payment yields; and, to increase the uniform ARP requirement for feed grain producers to offset the cost of higher payment yields. Also, allows producers to establish a surface reservoir on any part of their flexible acreage base and to declare such land to be in conservation use.	36 9	30 3
7/25/90	House	Wool and Mohair	Establishes a declining payment limitation for price support payments for wool and mohair over the 1991-1995 marketing years.	54	40
7/26/90	Senate	Wool and Mohair	Increases the payment limit for wool and mohair from \$50,000 to \$250,000, and freezes the established price for wool and mohair for the 1991-1995 marketing years.	53	40
7/26/90	Senate	Commodity-Related Studies	Requires a study of whether low cost forage produced with subsidized irrigation water contributes to excess fluid milk production.	113	67
7/26/90	Senate	Administrative Appeals	Provides for a formal procedure for the appeal of adverse administrative determinations made by any State or county ASCS committee.	100-105	60-64
7/26/90	Senate	Commodity-Related Studies	Provides for a review of minority participation in USDA programs, development of a plan to enhance minority participation, and a bi-annual report on progress with respect to the plan.	114	68
7/26/90	Senate	Deficiency Payments	Modified the repayment requirements for advance deficiency payments for certain producers.	31	27

SUMMARY OF AMENDMENTS ADOPTED FOR THE 1990 FARM BILL

PART I: COMMODITY PROGRAMS

Date	HSE/SEN	Topic	Description	Item	Page
7/27/90	Senate	Planting Flexibility	Requires the Secretary to ensure that Targeted Option Payments will not result in additional budget outlays.	7	2
7/27/90	Senate	Commodity-Related Studies	Requires a study concerning the effects of the multilateral elimination of agricultural trade limitations.	107	65
7/27/90	Senate	Commodity-Related Studies	Allows the Secretary, with concurrence from Congress, to prioritize the studies required by the Act and determine which of at least 12 must be completed.	115	69
7/27/90	Senate	Planting Flexibility	Requires targeted option payments to be budget neutral.	10	4
7/27/90	Senate	Commodity-Related Studies	Requires the Secretary to conduct a feasibility study of ways to reduce recordkeeping and paperwork by program participants.	116	69
8/1/90	House	Honey	Freezes the loan rate at 53.8 cents/lb. for 1991-1995; and, reduces the loan forfeiture limitation down to \$100,000 by 1994.	64	45
8/1/90	House	Payment Limitations	Sets payment limits of \$50,000 on deficiency payments; \$100,000 on marketing loan gains, Findley payments, loan deficiency payments, and inventory reduction payments; and, a \$200,000 aggregate limit on all payments.	47	36
8/1/90	House	Farmer Owned Reserve (FOR)	Storage payments to producers shall, to the extent practicable, take into account average rates paid for commercial storage in the state.	42	33
8/1/90	House	Dairy	Strikes requirements to issue proposed "total milk solids basis" formula within 30 days of enactment and final rule within 90 days of enactment.	69	47
8/1/90	House	Dairy	Changes purchase price for butter in FY91 from \$0.8150 to \$0.9825 per pound.	68	47

SUMMARY OF AMENDMENTS ADOPTED FOR THE 1990 FARM BILL

PART I: COMMODITY PROGRAMS

Date	HSE/SEN	Topic	Description	Item	Page
8/1/90	House	Dairy	Secretary shall sell for export in FY91 at least 184 million pounds of butter without regard for effect on world prices.	75	50
8/1/90	House	Acreage Reduction Programs	Permits producers to meet ACR requirements by idling end rows planted to a perennial cover crop.	18	11
8/1/90	House	Flexibility	Adds popcorn to the list of crops that may be planted on flexed acreage.	2	1
8/1/90	House	Target Prices	Secretary may adjust annual target prices to reflect year-to-year change in index of prices paid by farmers.	30	26
8/1/90	House	Payment Limitations	Secretary may modify regulations with regard to any married couple.	48	37
8/1/90	House	Planting Flexibility	Changes authority to permit harvesting of oats planted on ACR when oats is expected to be less than domestic demand from "shall" to "may."	7	2

COMPARISON OF PROPOSALS FOR THE 1990 FARM BILL--AS OF AUGUST 1, 1990

	Administration	House	Senate	Comments
	PLANTING FLEXIBILITY			
1) How much "permitted" acreage can be flexed?	100 percent of program crop bases plus oilseed plantings	25 percent of program crop bases plus oilseed plantings	25 percent of program crop bases	Flexible acreage is greatest under <u>Administration</u> and smallest under <u>Senate</u>
2) What crops can be flexed?	Program crops; conserving crops; oilseeds and certain nonprogram crops	Program crops; oilseeds; sweet sorghum, popcorn, guar, etc.; experimental and crops with no domestic production; herbaceous or short-rotation woody crops which Secretary deems necessary for ethanol or biomass production	Any program crop, oilseed crop, industrial and experimental crop (as designated by the Secretary) and any nonprogram, nonoilseed crop except any fruit and vegetable crop (including potatoes and edible beans) not designated as industrial or experimental by the Secretary	<u>Administration</u> and <u>House</u> exclude most nonprogram crops. <u>SENATE AMENDMENT 2335 (ADOPTED 7/24/90)</u> EXCLUDES MOST FRUIT AND VEGETABLE CROPS. <u>HOUSE EN BLOC AMENDMENTS (ADOPTED AS NOTED)</u> ADD HERBACEOUS CROPS FOR ETHANOL OR BIOMASS (7/25/90) AND POPCORN (8/1/90) TO CROPS ELIGIBLE TO BE FLEXED.
3) What restrictions apply to flexed acreage, other than crop eligibility?	None	Program crops may not be grown on oilseed crop acreage	No more than 25 percent of each individual program crop base can be flexed and program crops may not be grown on oilseed crop acreage	<u>Administration</u> has no other restrictions. <u>House</u> and <u>Senate</u> do not permit oilseed acreage to be reduced because of flexibility. <u>Senate</u> limits acreage shift to each individual program crop while under <u>Administration</u> and <u>House</u> , shifts are not limited to individual program crops.
4) Are deficiency payments reduced?	No, if program crops and oilseeds are planted. Yes, if certain nonprogram crops are harvested, on an acre-for-acre basis.	Yes, on an acre-for-acre basis.	Yes, on an acre-for-acre basis.	Flexible acreage would compete based on market prices under <u>Administration</u> and market price versus target price under <u>House</u> and <u>Senate</u> .
5) Are price support loans available on flexed acreage?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Any price support crop grown on a participating farm is eligible for price support.

COMPARISON OF PROPOSALS FOR THE 1990 FARM BILL--AS OF AUGUST 1, 1990

	Administration	House	Senate	Comments
6) Are bases changed as a result of flexibility?	No	No	No	The flexible acreage is considered planted to the original program crop.
7) May program crops be harvested on ACR?	Yes, the original program crop (but not other program crops or oilseeds) <u>with loss in deficiency payments</u> on an acre-for-acre basis.	Yes, <u>for wheat and feed grains (including oats)</u> the Secretary may permit the program crop to be grown on ACR <u>with an acre-for-acre loss in deficiency payments</u> . If domestic production of oats will not meet domestic demand, the Secretary may permit <u>oats planted on ACR</u> to be harvested with <u>no loss</u> in the program crop deficiency payment. Also, at the discretion of the Secretary, producers may receive deficiency payments and other program benefits on the oats. At Secretary's discretion, producers who only plant an acceptable variety of malting barley may be exempt from acreage limitation requirements as a condition for loans, purchases, and payments.	Yes, under the following condition: <u>Target Option Payments:</u> Producers may, at their option, <u>decrease their ARP</u> , but not by more than one-half of the announced ARP. The Secretary must <u>decrease the target price</u> , by not less than 0.5% nor more than 1.0% for each 1-percentage point decrease in the ARP.	SENATE AMENDMENT 2417 (ADOPTED 7/27/90) REQUIRES THE SECRETARY TO ENSURE THAT TARGETED OPTION PAYMENTS WILL NOT RESULT IN ADDITIONAL BUDGET OUTLAYS. THE SECRETARY MUST PROVIDE CONGRESS WITH AN ANALYSIS OF THE DETERMINATION. HOUSE AMENDMENT (ADOPTED 8/1/90) CHANGES AUTHORITY TO PERMIT HARVESTING OF OATS PLANTED ON ACR WHEN OATS PRODUCTION IS EXPECTED TO BE LESS THAN DOMESTIC DEMAND FROM "SHALL" TO "MAY." NOTE: THE <u>HOUSE</u> WHEAT TITLE WITH REGARD TO OATS HARVESTED ON ACR ACREAGE IS "SHALL" RATHER THAN "MAY" LANGUAGE AS SHOWN IN THE <u>HOUSE</u> COLUMN.

COMPARISON OF PROPOSALS FOR THE 1990 FARM BILL--AS OF AUGUST 1, 1990

	Administration	House	Senate	Comments
8) May other crops be harvested on ACR?	Yes, conserving crops and industrial crops (but not other program crops or oilseeds) <u>with loss in deficiency payments</u> on an acre-for-acre basis.	Yes, at the discretion of the Secretary, sweet sorghum, guar, etc., and other commodities if the Secretary determines such production is needed to provide an adequate supply of such commodities, is not likely to increase the cost of the price support program, and will not affect farm income adversely. Secretary has discretion to reduce deficiency payments on acreage planted to such crops.	<p><u>Planting Oilseeds or Other Crops on Reduced Acres:</u> Wheat, feedgrain, cotton and rice producers may elect to plant an oilseed or other such crop considered necessary by the Secretary on up to one-half of the reduced acreage on the farm, <u>with loss in deficiency payments</u> on a number of acres determined by the Secretary that will assure no additional cost to CCC.</p> <p><u>Planting Experimental or Industrial Crops, or harvesting conserving crops on Reduced Acreage:</u> Wheat, feedgrain, cotton and rice producers may elect to devote all their reduced acreage to a conserving, experimental, or industrial nonprogram crop, (if such crops are approved by the Secretary) <u>with loss in deficiency payments</u> on an acre-for-acre basis.</p>	<p><u>Senate</u> allows oilseeds on one-half of reduced acreage, or experimental, etc. on all reduced acreage, with loss of deficiency payments. <u>House</u> continues current ACR language.</p> <p>For <u>Senate</u> provision on planting oilseeds or other crops on reduced acres, if more than one crop is involved, payments will be reduced on a prorata basis.</p> <p>In <u>Senate</u> loss of deficiency payments for planting experimental, industrial, or harvesting conserving crops on reduced acreage is on a pro-rata basis if more than one program crop is involved.</p>
9) What other uses can be made of flexible acres?	Not specified.	A producer may construct a surface reservoir on land which is part of a flexible acreage base for a farm, and declare such land to be devoted to conservation uses if the land was planted to a program crop in 3 out of the last 5 years.	No such provision.	<u>HOUSE EN BLOC AMENDMENT (ADOPTED 7/25/90)</u> ALLOWS PRODUCERS TO CONSTRUCT SURFACE RESERVOIRS ON FLEXIBLE ACREAGE BASE, AND DECLARE SUCH ACREAGE TO BE IN CONSERVATION USE.

COMPARISON OF PROPOSALS FOR THE 1990 FARM BILL--AS OF AUGUST 1, 1990

	Administration	House	Senate	Comments																														
10) Can a producer idle a portion of program crop permitted acreage and still receive deficiency payments?	Yes, 0/92 provision if permitted acreage is <u>not</u> devoted to conserving uses, or 0/100 provision if permitted <u>is</u> devoted to conserving crops.	<p>Yes, 0/92 for wheat and feed grains, and 50/92 for cotton and rice, with harvesting of sweet sorghum, guar, etc., experimental crops or crops with no domestic production at discretion of Secretary. Cotton and rice have a discretionary 0/92, but mandates 0/92 for cotton and rice if prevented planting. Payment rates cannot be less than projected deficiency payments.</p> <p>Under the <u>Target Option Program</u>, wheat and feed grain producers may also, at their option, devote up to 10% of base to conserving uses and be eligible for up to a 1-percent increase in target price for each 1-percent increase in conserving use acres, but payments shall not exceed 92% of regular deficiency payments.</p>	<p>Yes, 0/92 for wheat and feed grains and 50/92 for cotton and rice, with harvesting of sweet sorghum, guar, etc., experimental crops or crops with no domestic production at discretion of Secretary. Mandates 0/92 for cotton and rice if prevented planting. Except for rice, payment rates cannot be less than projected deficiency payments.</p> <p>Minor oilseeds (not soybeans) may be harvested on 0/92 <u>but not 50/92</u> acreage at producer's option. If oilseeds are harvested, producer must elect 0/92 payments or oilseed loans.</p> <p>Under the <u>Target Option Program</u>, producers have the option to increase their ARP above the announced ARP percentage by:</p> <table><tr><td></td><td>Up to</td><td>Max</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>% points</td><td>ARP %</td></tr><tr><td>Wheat</td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>1991</td><td>10</td><td>25</td></tr><tr><td>1992-95</td><td>15</td><td>25</td></tr><tr><td>Feed Grains</td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>1991</td><td>5</td><td>20</td></tr><tr><td>1992-95</td><td>10</td><td>20</td></tr><tr><td>Upland Ctn</td><td>10</td><td>25</td></tr><tr><td>Rice</td><td>5</td><td>N/A</td></tr></table> <p>Secretary must <u>increase the target price</u> by 0.5 to 1.0 percent for each 1-percentage point increase in the ARP.</p>		Up to	Max		% points	ARP %	Wheat			1991	10	25	1992-95	15	25	Feed Grains			1991	5	20	1992-95	10	20	Upland Ctn	10	25	Rice	5	N/A	<p><u>Senate</u> provision provides more flexibility; <u>House</u> is less flexible.</p> <p><u>House</u> and <u>Senate</u> mandate 0/92 for cotton and rice for prevented planting.</p> <p><u>SENATE AMENDMENT 2303</u> (ADOPTED 7/19/90) ELIMINATED PROVISION TO PLANT MINOR OILSEEDS ON 50/92 ACREAGE. <u>HOUSE EN BLOC AMENDMENTS</u> (ADOPTED 7/24/90 & 7/25/90) REMOVED SECRETARY'S DISCRETION TO ALLOW MINOR OILSEEDS ON 0-50/92 ACRES.</p> <p><u>SENATE AMENDMENT 2303</u> (ADOPTED 7/19/90) REQUIRES THE SECRETARY, WHEN DETERMINING THE INCREASED ARP FOR UPLAND COTTON AND RICE, TO EXCLUDE AN AMOUNT OF ACREAGE EQUAL TO THE AVERAGE UNDERPLANTINGS OF UPLAND COTTON AND RICE DURING THE PREVIOUS 2 YEARS.</p> <p><u>SENATE AMENDMENT 2417</u> (ADOPTED 7/27/90) REQUIRES THE SECRETARY TO ENSURE THAT TARGETED OPTION PAYMENTS WILL NOT RESULT IN ADDITIONAL BUDGET OUTLAYS. THE SECRETARY MUST PROVIDE CONGRESS WITH AN ANALYSIS OF THE DETERMINATION.</p>
	Up to	Max																																
	% points	ARP %																																
Wheat																																		
1991	10	25																																
1992-95	15	25																																
Feed Grains																																		
1991	5	20																																
1992-95	10	20																																
Upland Ctn	10	25																																
Rice	5	N/A																																

FARM-LEVEL EXAMPLES OF HOUSE AND SENATE FLEXIBILITY PROPOSALS

SAMPLE FARM: 100 acres wheat base
 100 acres corn base
 100 acres soybeans

PROGRAM: 5% Wheat ARP
 15% Corn ARP

HOUSE

EXAMPLE H1: PRODUCER CONTINUES SAME AS
UNDER CURRENT LAW

Wheat ACR

Corn ACR		Soybean acres
Wheat acres	Corn acres	

	<u>Planted Acres</u>	<u>Payment Acres</u>
SBN	100	-
CRN	85	85
WHT	95	95

SENATE

EXAMPLE S1: PRODUCER CONTINUES SAME AS
UNDER CURRENT LAW

Wheat ACR

Wheat ACR		Soybean acres
Wheat acres	Corn acres	

	<u>Planted Acres</u>	<u>Payment Acres</u>
SBN	100	-
CRN	85	85
WHT	95	95

EXAMPLE H2: MAXIMUM SOYBEAN ACREAGE

Wheat ACR

-----	Corn ACR	Soybean acres
Soybean ac	-----	
	Soybean ac	
Wheat acres	Corn acres	

Planted
AcresPayment
Acres

SBN	175	-
CRN	45	45
WHT	60	60

EXAMPLE S2: MAXIMUM SOYBEAN ACREAGE

Wheat ACR

-----	Corn ACR	Soybean acres
Soybean ac	-----	
	Soybean ac	
Wheat acres	Corn acres	

Planted
AcresPayment
Acres

SBN	150	-
CRN	60	60
WHT	70	70

EXAMPLE H3: ALTERNATIVE MAXIMUM SOYBEAN ACREAGE

Wheat ACR

-----	Corn ACR	Soybean acres
Soybean acres	-----	
	Corn acres	
Wheat acres		

Planted
AcresPayment
Acres

SBN	175	-
CRN	85	85
WHT	20	20

EXAMPLE S3: ALTERNATIVE MAXIMUM SOYBEAN ACREAGE

Senate flexibility option limits flexible acres to 25% of individual program crop bases. Hence, soybeans (or other crops) planted on flexible acres must be allocated across all eligible program crop bases as in example S2.

EXAMPLE H4: MAXIMUM ALTERNATIVE PROGRAM CROP ACREAGE

Wheat ACR

-----	Corn ACR	Soybean acres
Cotton acres	Corn acres	
Wheat acres		

	<u>Planted Acres</u>	<u>Payment Acres</u>
SBN	100	-
CRN	85	85
WHT	20	20
CTN	75	-

EXAMPLE S4: MAXIMUM ALTERNATIVE PROGRAM CROP ACREAGE

Wheat ACR

-----	Corn ACR	Soybean acres
Cotton ac	Cotton ac	
Wheat acres	Corn acres	

	<u>Planted Acres</u>	<u>Payment Acres</u>
SBN	100	-
CRN	60	60
WHT	70	70
CTN	50	-

EXAMPLE H5: MAXIMUM NONPROGRAM CROP ACREAGE

Wheat ACR

-----	Corn ACR	Sesame ac
Guar ac	Kenaf ac	Soybean acres
Wheat acres	Corn acres	

	<u>Planted Acres</u>	<u>Payment Acres</u>
SBN	75	-
CRN	60	60
WHT	70	70
NONPGM	75	-

EXAMPLE S5: MAXIMUM NONPROGRAM CROP ACREAGE

Wheat ACR

-----	Corn ACR	Soybean acres
Watermelons	Dry Beans	
Wheat acres	Corn acres	

	<u>Planted Acres</u>	<u>Payment Acres</u>
SBN	100	-
CRN	60	60
WHT	70	70
NONPGM	50	-

FARM-LEVEL EXAMPLES OF ADMINISTRATION FLEXIBILITY PROPOSAL

SAMPLE FARM: 100 acres wheat base
 100 acres corn base
 100 acres soybeans

PROGRAM: 5% Wheat ARP
 15% Corn ARP

EXAMPLE A1: PRODUCER CONTINUES SAME AS UNDER CURRENT LAW

Wheat ACR

-----	Corn ACR	
Wheat acres	Corn acres	Soybean acres

	<u>Planted Acres</u>	<u>Payment Acres</u>
SBN	100	-
CRN	85	85
WHT	95	95

EXAMPLE A2: MAXIMUM FLEXIBILITY AMONG ELIGIBLE CROPS

Wheat ACR

	Corn ACR
Wheat, Corn, Soybeans or any other NCA crop in any proportion.	

	<u>Planted Acres</u>	<u>Payment Acres</u>
SBN		-
CRN		85
WHT		95

EXAMPLE A3: PRODUCER PLANTS PROGRAM CROPS
ON ACR

Wheat acres

-----	Corn acres	
Wheat acres	Corn acres	Soybean acres

	<u>Planted Acres</u>	<u>Payment Acres</u>
SBN	100	-
CRN	100	70
WHT	100	90

EXAMPLE A4: PRODUCER INCREASES SOYBEANS
WHILE MAINTAINING CORN AND
WHEAT

Wheat ACR

-----	Corn acres	
Wheat acres	Corn acres	Soybean acres
	Soybean ac	

	<u>Planted Acres</u>	<u>Payment Acres</u>
SBN	115	-
CRN	85	70
WHT	95	95

EXAMPLE A5: CONSERVING USE CROP PLANTED
BUT NOT HARVESTED ON
ENTIRE NCA ("0/100")

Wheat ACR

-----	Corn ACR	
Sweet Clover not for Harvest	Sweet Clover not for Harvest	Sweet Clover not for Harvest

	<u>Planted Acres</u>	<u>Payment Acres</u>
SBN	0	-
CRN	0	85
WHT	0	95

EXAMPLE A6: PRODUCER PLANTS EXPERIMENTAL
CROP ON ACR

Kenaf acres

Wheat acres	Corn acres	Soybean acres

	<u>Planted Acres</u>	<u>Payment Acres</u>
SBN	100	-
CRN	85	70
WHT	95	90

COMPARISON OF PROPOSALS FOR THE 1990 FARM BILL--AS OF AUGUST 1, 1990

	Administration	House	Senate	Comments
	ACREAGE REDUCTION PROGRAMS (ARP)			
11) Wheat ARPs determined as?	Based on stocks-to-use (S/U) ratio for preceding marketing year. <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around;"> <div> <u>S/U</u> >40 ≤40 </div> <div> <u>ARP</u> 12.5 - 20.0 < 12.5 </div> </div>	Based on S/U of <u>current</u> marketing year. <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around;"> <div> <u>S/U</u> >40 ≤40 </div> <div> <u>ARP</u> 20.0 - 30.0 ≤ 20.0 </div> </div>	Based on S/U of <u>preceding</u> marketing year. <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around;"> <div> <u>S/U</u> >40 ≤40 </div> <div> <u>ARP</u> 12.5 - 20.0 0.0 - 12.5 </div> </div>	Administration and Senate have the same ARPs. ARPs under House are larger. S/U under Administration and Senate are based on previous year, while House is based on current year estimate. Senate provides authority for a zero ARP.
12) Feed Grain ARPs determined as?	Based on stocks-to-use (S/U) ratio for preceding marketing year. <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around;"> <div> <u>S/U</u> >25 ≤25 </div> <div> <u>ARP</u> 12.5 - 20.0 < 12.5 </div> </div>	Based on S/U of <u>preceding</u> marketing year. <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around;"> <div> <u>S/U</u> >25.0 >22.8≤25.0 ≥21.6<22.8 <21.6 </div> <div> <u>ARP</u> 12.5 - 20.0 ≤ 12.5 11.6 - 12.5 ≤ 12.5 </div> </div>	Based on S/U of <u>preceding</u> marketing year. <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around;"> <div> <u>S/U</u> >25 ≤25 </div> <div> <u>ARP</u> 12.5 - 20.0 0.0 - 12.5 </div> </div>	All have the same ARPs and all are based on stocks/use ratio of preceding year. Senate provides authority for a zero ARP. HOUSE AMENDMENT (ADOPTED 7/25/90) ADDED ADDITIONAL S/U TRIGGER FOR ARP.
13) Oats ARPs determined as?	Same requirements as feed grains.	Not to exceed 5% unless supplies deemed to be excessive.	Same requirements as feed grains.	Oats ARP can not exceed 5% in House; Senate and Administration maximum is tied to feed grains ARP. Senate provides authority for a zero ARP.
14) Rice ARPs determined as?	Achieve 20% S/U to maximum extent practicable.	Achieve S/U of 16.5% - 20.0% of the 3 preceding marketing years, not to exceed 35%. "Maximum extent practicable" language deleted.	Achieve S/U of 16.5 - 20% of the 3 preceding marketing years, not to exceed 35%. "Maximum extent practicable" language deleted.	House and Senate deletes "maximum extent practicable" language. Senate provides authority for a zero ARP.
15) Upland Cotton ARPs determined as?	Achieve 30% S/U to maximum extent practicable.	Achieve 30% S/U, not to exceed 25% ARP.	Higher of 4 million bale ending stocks or S/U of 33%, not to exceed 25% ARP.	Senate has highest stock levels. Senate provides authority for a zero ARP.

COMPARISON OF PROPOSALS FOR THE 1990 FARM BILL--AS OF AUGUST 1, 1990

	Administration	House	Senate	Comments
16) ELS Cotton ARPs determined as?	Achieve 40% S/U to maximum extent practicable.	Secretarial discretion to establish if total supply is excessive.	Secretarial discretion to establish if total supply is excessive.	<u>House</u> and <u>Senate</u> continue 1985 Act provisions.
17) What about annual or perennial cover for ACR?	Producers are required to plant 50 percent of their ACR, not to exceed 5 percent of a crop acreage base, to an annual or perennial cover crop each year. If the farmer chooses to establish a perennial cover crop, the government would cost-share 50 percent of the establishment costs.	The Secretary should encourage participants in acreage reduction programs to plant an annual or perennial vegetative cover on ACR that provides full season coverage capable of naturally improving soil fertility, reducing erosion, and for other purposes, unless the producer's conservation plan requires otherwise.	A participating producer is required to plant an annual or perennial cover on at least 50 percent of the acreage removed from production, not to exceed 5 percent of the crop acreage base. If the producer elects to establish a perennial cover, CCC shall make cost share assistance available for 25 percent of the approved cost of establishing the cover on not more than 50 percent of the acreage diverted from production.	<u>SENATE AMENDMENT 2303 (ADOPTED 7/19/90) CHANGED THE PERCENT OF COST SHARE FROM 50% TO 25%.</u>
18) Can end rows be used for ACR?	Not Addressed	Producers shall be allowed to meet ACR requirements, regardless of whether they meet minimum acreage requirements, if: 1) End rows are planted to perennial cover crops. 2) will result in substantial soil loss reductions. 3) Each acre idled shall count as 0.9 acre toward meeting ACR requirement. CCC can reduce credit on a case-by-case basis. 4) Provision must result in budget neutrality.	No such provision.	<u>HOUSE AMENDMENT (ADOPTED 8/1/90) PERMITS PRODUCERS TO MEET ACR REQUIREMENTS BY IDLING END ROWS THAT ARE PLANTED TO PERENNIAL COVER CROPS.</u>

COMPARISON OF PROPOSALS FOR THE 1990 FARM BILL--AS OF AUGUST 1, 1990

	Administration	House	Senate	Comments
19) What about the half-ARP program?	Not addressed.	For <u>upland cotton and rice</u> the Secretary <u>may</u> make loan deficiency payments available in the form of upland cotton or rice owned by the CCC or in such other form as the Secretary is authorized to make, to producers who agree to forgo obtaining a loan or receiving a deficiency payment, and who do not plant in excess of crop acreage base less one/half of the ARP requirement.	Same as the <u>House</u> , except that the Secretary <u>shall</u> make such payments to eligible producers.	<u>House</u> continues current law. <u>Senate</u> changes "may" authority to "shall."
19a) What about skiprow practices?	Not addressed.	For the 1991-1995 crops of upland cotton, the skiprow rules established in Section 374(a) of the 1938 Act shall allow 30-inch to be taken into account for classifying the acreage planted to cotton and the area skipped.	For the 1990-1995 crops of upland cotton, the skiprow rules shall allow the Secretary to take other skiprow practices into account for classifying the acreage planted to cotton and the acreage skipped and the Secretary shall take other practices into account.	The <u>House</u> amends the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to allow 30 inch rows to be classified as skiprow; the <u>Senate</u> allows the Secretary to take other skiprow practices into account when classifying the acreage planted to cotton.
19b) What about preliminary allotments for the 1996 cotton crop?	Not addressed.	The preliminary allotments for the 1996 crop of cotton shall be the permanent State, county, and farm base acreage allotments for the 1977 crop of upland cotton, adjusted for underplantings in 1977 and reconstitutions.	Same as <u>House</u> .	The <u>House</u> and <u>Senate</u> establish the preliminary allotments for cotton for the 1996 crop equal to the permanent farm acreage bases for the 1977 crop of upland cotton.

COMPARISON OF PROPOSALS FOR THE 1990 FARM BILL--AS OF AUGUST 1, 1990

	Administration	House	Senate	Comments
	PAID LAND DIVERSION (PLD)			
20) Is a paid land diversion required?	<u>All Commodities:</u> Discretionary	<u>Wheat, Feed Grains, Rice, ELS Cotton:</u> Discretionary. <u>Upland Cotton:</u> Must offer up to 15% PLD at a payment rate of not less than 35 cents per pound if projected carryover exceeds 8 million bales.	<u>Cotton:</u> If ARP alone can not achieve stocks target, implementation of PLD is mandatory. <u>Other Commodities:</u> Discretionary	<u>Senate</u> and <u>House</u> require mandatory upland cotton PLD when stocks are high; no requirements for PLD under <u>Administration</u> .

COMPARISON OF PROPOSALS FOR THE 1990 FARM BILL--AS OF AUGUST 1, 1990

	Administration	House	Senate	Comments												
	LOAN RATES															
21) How are loan rates for wheat and feed grains determined?	<p>Wheat and Feed Grains: Basic loan set at 75-85% of 5-year moving average, dropping the high and low years, but decline limited to no more than 5%. Discretionary "Findley" adjustment at no more than 20%.</p>	<p>Wheat and Feed Grains: Basic loan set at 85% of 5-year moving average, dropping high and low, but decline limited to no more than 5%. "Findley" adjustment authorized based on current year S/U as follows.</p> <table><tr><td>Wheat S/U</td><td>Corn S/U</td><td>"Findley" Adjust</td></tr><tr><td>≥30</td><td>≥25</td><td>-10%</td></tr><tr><td>≥15<30</td><td>≥12.5<25</td><td>- 5%</td></tr><tr><td><15</td><td><12.5</td><td>0%</td></tr></table> <p>Notwithstanding the above S/U adjustment, minimum loan rate for wheat (corn) set at \$2.44 (\$1.76) per bushel, unless such rate would exceed 80% of 5-year moving average market price determination.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the S/U adjustment authority, the Secretary may further reduce loan rates up to an additional 10 percent to maintain a competitive market position.</p>	Wheat S/U	Corn S/U	"Findley" Adjust	≥30	≥25	-10%	≥15<30	≥12.5<25	- 5%	<15	<12.5	0%	<p>Wheat and Feed Grains: Plan A: Marketing loan for wheat and feed grains with loan level established at 75-85 percent of a 5-year moving average of market prices, dropping high and low. Loan rate can not be below \$1.96 for corn and \$2.44 for wheat (1990 basic loan rates), and no provision for Findley adjustment.</p> <p>Plan B: Basic loan same as above formula, but with discretionary Findley adjustment at no more than 20%, with marketing loan required. The Secretary would be required to provide producers with an advance compensation equal to 75% of the Findley loan reduction amount. The advance compensation must be made available during October of the year in which the crop is harvested, to be repaid within 270 days after it was made available.</p>	<p>Administration continues current law. Senate has highest potential loan rates, and requires marketing loans. House limits Findley authority.</p> <p>HOUSE EN BLOC AMENDMENT (ADOPTED 7/25/90) ESTABLISHED MINIMUM LOAN RATES FOR WHEAT AND CORN.</p> <p>SENATE AMENDMENT 2303 (ADOPTED 7/19/90) CHANGED THE TIMING OF THE ADVANCE COMPENSATION PAYMENT SO THAT PAYMENT AND REPAYMENT WOULD FALL WITHIN A SINGLE FISCAL YEAR.</p> <p>HOUSE AMENDMENT (ADOPTED 7/25/90) CHANGED LIMIT ON DISCRETIONARY ADJUSTMENT TO MAINTAIN COMPETITIVE POSITION FROM 5% TO 10%.</p>
Wheat S/U	Corn S/U	"Findley" Adjust														
≥30	≥25	-10%														
≥15<30	≥12.5<25	- 5%														
<15	<12.5	0%														

COMPARISON OF PROPOSALS FOR THE 1990 FARM BILL--AS OF AUGUST 1, 1990

	Administration	House	Senate	Comments
22) Are there any special provisions for wheat loan rates?	No.	Yes. From June 1, 1991, to September 30, 1991, the loan rate for wheat shall not be less than \$1.93. Beginning October 1, 1991, wheat producers will receive an increase in the loan rate to equal the above S/U provisions.	No.	
23) How are loan rates for upland and ELS cotton determined?	<p><u>Upland Cotton</u>: Same formula as for wheat and feed grains, with no minimum.</p> <p><u>ELS Cotton</u>: Same formula as for wheat and feed grains.</p>	<p><u>Upland Cotton</u>: Lesser of 85% of 5-year moving average of spot market prices, dropping the high and low, or 90% of average of 15-week period of 5 lowest growths quoted for Northern Europe. The loan rate may not be reduced more than 5% in any year and may not be below 50 cents per pound.</p> <p><u>ELS Cotton</u>: 85% of 5-year moving average of market prices, dropping the high and low.</p>	<p><u>Upland Cotton</u>: Same as House.</p> <p><u>ELS Cotton</u>: Same as House.</p>	<u>Administration</u> removes minimum levels for loan rates. <u>House</u> and <u>Senate</u> have the potential for the largest loan rates.
24) How are loan rates for rice determined?	Same formula as for wheat and feed grains, with no minimums.	85% of 5-year moving average of market prices, dropping high and low. The loan rate may not be reduced more than 5% in any year and may not be below \$6.50 per hundredweight.	Same as House.	<u>Administration</u> has lowest loan rates, without minimums, and makes all loan rate calculations consistent across crops.

COMPARISON OF PROPOSALS FOR THE 1990 FARM BILL--AS OF AUGUST 1, 1990

	Administration	House	Senate	Comments
24a) What other adjustments apply to loan rates?	No such provision.	<p><u>Crops other than cotton:</u> Appropriate adjustments may be made in the support price for any commodity except cotton for differences in grade, type, quality, location and other factors. Such adjustments shall, so far as practicable, be made in such manner that the average support price for such commodity will, on the basis of the anticipated incidence of such factors, be equal to the level of support determined in the Act.</p> <p><u>Cotton:</u> Appropriate adjustments may be made in the support price for cotton for differences in quality factors and location. Beginning with the 1991 crop, the premiums and discounts for quality factors for the upland cotton program shall be established by the Secretary by giving equal weight to (1) loan differences for the preceding crop and (2) market differences for such crop in the designated United States spot market.</p>	Same as <u>House</u> except that for each of the 1991-1995 crops of wheat and feed grains, no adjustment in the loan rate applicable to a particular region, State, or county for the purpose of reflecting transportation differentials may increase or decrease the regional, State, or county loan rate from the level established for the previous year by more than the percentage change in the national average loan rate plus or minus 2 percent.	Both <u>House</u> and <u>Senate</u> allow the Secretary to adjust loan rates for differences in quality, etc., and give requirements for setting premiums and discounts for cotton support prices. The <u>Senate</u> places a \pm 2 percent limit on adjustments in support prices due to transportation differentials.

COMPARISON OF PROPOSALS FOR THE 1990 FARM BILL--AS OF AUGUST 1, 1990

	Administration	House	Senate	Comments
24b) What about support prices for cottonseed and cottonseed oil?	No such provision.	If the Secretary determines that any oilseed program is likely to cause a reduction in prices received by producers for cottonseed or by processors for cottonseed oil, the Secretary shall take such actions as are necessary to offset the actual or anticipated impact of such program on prices for cottonseed or cottonseed oil. Such actions shall only include actions to stabilize or increase the price of cottonseed, and shall not include actions to decrease the prices of other oilseeds.	Same as <u>House</u> , except does not include the proviso that actions to offset the impact of oilseed programs must only include actions to stabilize or increase the price of cottonseed or cottonseed oil.	Both the <u>House</u> and <u>Senate</u> require the Secretary to take actions to support cottonseed or cottonseed oil if it is determined that other oilseed programs will likely have an adverse impact.

COMPARISON OF PROPOSALS FOR THE 1990 FARM BILL--AS OF AUGUST 1, 1990

	Administration	House	Senate	Comments
24c) What about marketing certificates for rice?	No such provision.	Whenever during August 1, 1991 and July 31, 1996, the world price for a class of rice is below the loan repayment rate for that class of rice, the CCC shall make payments in the form of negotiable marketing certificates to eligible program participants. The value of the certificates shall be based on the difference between the loan repayment rate for the class of rice, and the prevailing world price, as determined by the Secretary under a published formula submitted for public comment before its adoption. The certificates may be exchanged for cash, marketed, or exchanged for CCC-owned commodities. Certificate holders may designate the location of commodities they wish to receive in exchange for such certificates. The Secretary may charge storage and carrying charges if the commodities so designated are not exchanged within a reasonable time period.	Same as <u>House</u> .	Both the <u>House</u> and <u>Senate</u> require CCC to make payments to producers in the form of negotiable marketing certificates whenever the prevailing world price is below the rice loan redemption value, as determined by the Secretary.

COMPARISON OF PROPOSALS FOR THE 1990 FARM BILL--AS OF AUGUST 1, 1990

	Administration	House	Senate	Comments
24d) What about price support loans for high moisture feed grains?	No such provision.	Effective for the 1991-1995 crops of feed grains, the Secretary shall make recourse loans available to producers who normally harvest all or a portion of their crop of feed grains in a high moisture state; who present evidence of ownership of the grain; and, who participate in an acreage reduction program for feed grains established by the Secretary. The amount of the loan shall be the acreage of the feed grain in a high moisture state harvested on the producer's farm multiplied by the lower of the producer's program yield or actual yield on a similar field.	No such provision.	The House requires <u>recourse</u> loans be offered to eligible producers for high moisture feed grains.

COMPARISON OF PROPOSALS FOR THE 1990 FARM BILL--AS OF AUGUST 1, 1990

	Administration	House	Senate	Comments
24e) What about recalculation of barley advance deficiency payment refunds for the 1988 or 1989 crop?	No such provision.	Not later than 45 days after enactment, the Secretary shall calculate, for informational purposes only, the amount of the refund of any advance deficiency payment for the 1988 or 1989 crops of barley. The recalculation shall be based on a formula that includes the human food values of barley in all components of the calculation. The Secretary shall publish in the Federal Register the results of the recalculation, including the formula used, the number of producers affected, the aggregate effects of using the recalculation formula, and the decision as to whether to use the formula to make such recalculations (including reasons). The Secretary shall make available to each producer who requests it a statement of the effects of the calculation of refunds would have on the producer's 1988 or 1989 crops of barley. The Secretary may use the formula to determine whether to reduce the total amount of the refund owed by producers or 1988 or 1989 crops of barley.	No such provision.	The <u>House</u> provision requires the Secretary to recalculate the refund of advance deficiency payments for the 1988 or 1989 crops of barley, but the Secretary has discretion whether to use the formula in determining the amount of the refund. A separate <u>Senate</u> provision (Item 31) states that any language relating to refund of barley advance deficiency payments is considered nondiscretionary.

COMPARISON OF PROPOSALS FOR THE 1990 FARM BILL--AS OF AUGUST 1, 1990

	Administration	House	Senate	Comments
24f) What about loans and purchases for the 1996 crops?	No such provision.	<p>In the case of the 1996 crop, the Secretary shall make available to producers who fully comply with the provisions of the 1995 acreage reduction program:</p> <p><u>If legislation enacted subsequent to this Act:</u> loans and purchases in accordance with such subsequent legislation.</p> <p><u>If legislation enacted subsequent to this Act which states that loans and purchases shall not be made for the 1996 crops:</u> the Secretary may make loans and purchases available at the level determined for the 1995 crops.</p> <p><u>If legislation is not enacted subsequent to this Act pertaining to loans and purchases for the 1996 crops, and loans and purchases are available under previously enacted legislation:</u> none of the provisions of this section shall apply to the 1996 crops.</p> <p>Deficiency payments for the 1996 crop are to be calculated on the basis of the 1995 target prices.</p>	<p>The Secretary may offer producers of 1996 program crops to participate in commodity support, production adjustment, and payment programs based upon terms and conditions of the relevant sections pertaining to each crop. Any target price or loan rates made available for each of the 1996 crops shall be equal to those for the 1995 crops. The Secretary may offer each of the programs provided for if a final announcement for the 1996 programs have not been made prior to June 1, 1995, for wheat; September 30, 1995, for feed grains; November 1, 1995, for upland cotton; December 1, 1995, for ELS cotton; January 31, 1996, for rice; July 15, 1995, for oilseeds; and November 1, 1995, for dairy. Producers may not participate in such programs unless subsequent legislation has been enacted which provides for loans and purchases for the 1996 crops.</p>	<p>The <u>House</u> provision is mandatory, while the <u>Senate</u> provision is discretionary.</p>

COMPARISON OF PROPOSALS FOR THE 1990 FARM BILL--AS OF AUGUST 1, 1990

	Administration	House	Senate	Comments
24g) What about disaster assistance for producers in the Big Horn River Drainage System?	No such provision.	The Secretary shall make prevented planting or reduced yield disaster payments to producers who are prevented from planting or who suffer reduced yields as a result of adjudication of Indian water rights. Provision applies to all program crops.	The Secretary may make disaster payments available to producers on farms which suffered losses on their 1990 crop of wheat, barley, oats, grass hay, and alfalfa hay due to drought induced by a lack of water as a result of Indian Tribal water rights adjudication on the Wind River Indian Reservation. The disaster payments may be made available under terms and conditions similar to those of titles I and III of the Disaster Assistance Act of 1989. Assistance shall be drawn from a pool not to exceed \$250,000. Producers do not have to acquire multiperil crop insurance to qualify.	The <u>House</u> language makes prevented planting or reduced yield disaster payments available to affected producers for any of the 1991-1995 program crops. The <u>Senate</u> makes disaster payments available to affected producers of certain 1990 crops similar to provisions in the Disaster Assistance Act of 1989.

COMPARISON OF PROPOSALS FOR THE 1990 FARM BILL--AS OF AUGUST 1, 1990

	Administration	House	Senate	Comments								
	OILSEED MARKETING LOANS											
25) Are marketing loans for oilseeds required?	No marketing loan specified. Nonrecourse loan set at 75%-85% of 5-year average price, dropping high and low, with a \$4.50 minimum.	<p><u>Soybeans</u>: For 1991-92 crops, marketing loan set at \$5.25/bu. For 1993-95, set according to following S/U ratio, except 1993 rate cannot exceed \$5.40/bu.</p> <table><tr><td>S/U Ratio</td><td>Mandated Adjustment</td></tr><tr><td>>25%</td><td>0% to -5%</td></tr><tr><td>>20% <25%</td><td>0%</td></tr><tr><td>≤20%</td><td>+5%</td></tr></table> <p><u>Other Oilseeds</u>: For 1991-95 crops, based on market price relation to soybeans but, except in the case of cottonseed, not less than level established for soybeans on a per-pound basis. Includes sunflower, canola, rapeseed, safflower, flaxseed, mustard seed and others designated by Secretary.</p>	S/U Ratio	Mandated Adjustment	>25%	0% to -5%	>20% <25%	0%	≤20%	+5%	<p><u>Soybeans</u>: For 1991-95 crops, marketing loan set at \$5.50/bu. Secretary has authority to reduce level, depending on estimated stocks-to-use ratios.</p> <p>\$5.25 if S/U > 19% \$5.00 if S/U > 25%</p> <p><u>Other Oilseeds</u>: For 1991-95 crops, Secretary must establish marketing loans for sunflowerseed, canola, rapeseed, safflower and flaxseed at 9.7 cents/lb. and adjust accordingly if soybean loans are adjusted. Secretary may establish marketing loans for other oilseeds based on market price relation to soybeans.</p> <p>The Secretary shall ensure that the program is operated so as to minimize loan forfeitures, stock accumulation, and cost to the Government.</p>	<p><u>House</u> and <u>Senate</u> would require a marketing loan for oilseeds, and would expand price support to oilseeds not currently eligible for loan. Marketing loans would be paid on full production. <u>House</u> would likely have lower marketing loan for 1991-93, and higher than <u>Senate</u> (by one cent) in 1994-95. <u>Senate</u> level would likely remain at \$5.50 for 1991-95.</p> <p><u>SENATE AMENDMENT 2303</u> (ADOPTED 7/19/90) CHANGED THE S/U TRIGGER FOR SOYBEANS FROM 20% TO 19%.</p> <p><u>SENATE AMENDMENT 2374</u> (ADOPTED 7/25/90) TO MINIMIZE STOCK ACCUMULATION AND CCC OUTLAYS FOR THE OILSEED MARKETING LOAN PROGRAM.</p>
S/U Ratio	Mandated Adjustment											
>25%	0% to -5%											
>20% <25%	0%											
≤20%	+5%											

COMPARISON OF PROPOSALS FOR THE 1990 FARM BILL--AS OF AUGUST 1, 1990

	Administration	House	Senate	Comments
	UPLAND COTTON MARKETING LOANS			
26) Is the marketing loan for upland cotton required?	Yes, with no change from current law.	<p>Yes, but with the following changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Includes a 3-step procedure to assure that U.S. cotton is competitive in world markets: <p><u>Step 1:</u> Codifies the Oct. 1989 USDA discretionary adjustment rule.</p> <p><u>Step 2:</u> Requires that marketing certificates be issued to domestic users and exporters when the Friday through Thursday (F-Th) average of the lowest price U.S. growth as quoted in Northern Europe exceeds the F-Th average of the 5 cheapest Northern Europe prices by more than 1.25 cents/lb. for four consecutive weeks.</p> <p><u>Step 3:</u> Provides for a special import quota if the F-Th average of the lowest price U.S. growth (adjusted for any certificate value in step 2) as quoted in Northern Europe exceeds the F-Th average of the 5 cheapest Northern Europe prices by more than 1.25 cents/lb. for 10 consecutive weeks.</p>	<p>Yes, but with the following changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as House. 	<p>The October, 1989 USDA discretionary adjustment rule provides for an additional adjustment in the adjusted world price (AWP) whenever:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The formula-derived AWP is less than 115 percent of the basic loan level, and The Friday through Thursday average of the lowest price U.S. growth as quoted in Northern Europe exceeds the Friday through Thursday average of the 5 cheapest Northern Europe prices. <p>The amount of the adjustment cannot exceed the difference between the Friday through Thursday average of the lowest price U.S. growth as quoted in Northern Europe and the Friday through Thursday average of the 5 cheapest Northern Europe prices.</p>

COMPARISON OF PROPOSALS FOR THE 1990 FARM BILL--AS OF AUGUST 1, 1990

	Administration	House	Senate	Comments
27) On what basis are loan deficiency payments made?	No change from current law (based on program yields).	Loan deficiency payments to be made on the basis of actual production.	Same as House.	<u>House</u> and <u>Senate</u> remove the program yield limit on loan deficiency payments.
28) Does USDA have authority to issue cotton-specific certificates?	Yes, no change in current law.	Eliminates authority to issue cotton-specific certificates.	Same as House.	Any certificate issued under the <u>House</u> and <u>Senate</u> would be generic.
29) Are Plan A and Plan B continued?	Continues Plan A and Plan B as in current law.	Continues Plan A and Plan B as in current law.	Eliminates Plan A and modifies Plan B by eliminating the 80% limit on the loan repayment rate.	<u>Administration</u> and <u>House</u> continues current law. Under the <u>Senate</u> , Plan A is eliminated and Plan B is modified.

COMPARISON OF PROPOSALS FOR THE 1990 FARM BILL--AS OF AUGUST 1, 1990

	Administration	House	Senate	Comments
	TARGET PRICES			
30) How are target prices determined?	<p><u>All Commodities:</u> Not specified.</p>	<p><u>All Commodities:</u> Not less than 1990 level except ELS cotton, which is 120% of ELS loan rate.</p> <p>Secretary may provide for annual adjustments in target prices for all program crops to reflect the year-to-year change in the index of price paid by farmers for production items, interest, taxes, and wage rates.</p> <p>Wheat and feed grain target prices shall be adjusted as follows:</p> <p><u>Wheat:</u> For each 2.5-percentage-point increase in the wheat ARP level above 22.5%, the target price for the year shall be increased 2.55%</p> <p><u>Feed Grains:</u> For each 2.5-percentage-point increase in the corn ARP level above 17.5%, the target price for the year shall be increased by 2.55%.</p>	<p><u>All Commodities:</u> Not less than 1990 level, except oats:</p> <p>1991 - \$1.55 1992 - \$1.65 1993 - \$1.75 1994 - \$1.85 1995 - \$1.85</p>	<p>All proposals would allow target prices to be frozen at the 1990 level except for oats (<u>Senate</u> escalates out year targets). <u>House</u> would require increases in targets for wheat and feed grains if ARPs are increased above certain levels.</p> <p><u>HOUSE AMENDMENT (ADOPTED 8/1/90)</u> STATES THAT THE SECRETARY MAY ADJUST ANNUAL TARGET PRICES FOR ALL PROGRAM CROPS TO REFLECT YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGES IN THE INDEX OF PRICES PAID BY FARMERS.</p> <p><u>HOUSE EN BLOC AMENDMENT (ADOPTED 7/25/90)</u> ESTABLISHED HIGHER MINIMUM ARP LEVELS BEFORE HIGHER TARGET PRICES APPLY.</p>

COMPARISON OF PROPOSALS FOR THE 1990 FARM BILL--AS OF AUGUST 1, 1990

	Administration	House	Senate	Comments
	DEFICIENCY PAYMENT RATES			
31) How are deficiency payments determined?	<p><u>Wheat and Feed Grains:</u> Difference between target and <u>5-month</u> price.</p> <p><u>Findley Payments:</u> Issue at fifth month based on forecast of 12-month price.</p> <p><u>Barley:</u> No change from current law.</p> <p><u>Oats:</u> No change from current law.</p> <p><u>Cotton and Rice:</u> No change from current law.</p>	<p><u>Wheat and Feed Grains:</u> Difference between target and <u>6-month</u> price.</p> <p><u>Findley Payments:</u> Issue at twelfth month.</p> <p><u>Barley:</u> Use <u>feed</u> barley rather than <u>all</u> barley market price to determine payment rate. Advance deficiency payments for 1991 crop of barley calculated on basis of <u>all</u> barley price.</p> <p><u>Oats:</u> Secretary has discretion to allow oat (and only oat) harvesting on all program crop ACR if domestic demand is projected to exceed domestic supply. Such oat production is eligible for oat deficiency payments.</p> <p><u>Cotton and Rice:</u> No change from current law.</p>	<p><u>Wheat and Feed Grains:</u> Difference between target and 5-month price.</p> <p><u>Findley Payments:</u> Issue at 5th month based on difference between basic loan and 5-month price.</p> <p><u>Barley:</u> If malting barley prices exceed feed barley prices by more than \$0.22, the excess will not be considered in establishing the barley deficiency payments.</p> <p>Producers who received an advance deficiency payment for the 1988 or 1989 crops, are in a county designated as eligible for disaster assistance, and who suffered more than a 65% crop loss on any of the 1988-90 crops, may repay the advance 1988 or 1989 deficiency payments in 3 equal installments during 1990-92, if their refund exceeds \$1,500.</p> <p><u>Cotton and Rice:</u> No change from current law.</p>	<p><u>House</u> decreases deficiency payment rate for wheat and feed grains by using 6-month price, and requires deficiency payments for oats planted on ACR, if authorized. <u>House</u> increases deficiency payments for barley by using feed barley price only.</p> <p><u>SENATE AMENDMENT 2376</u> (ADOPTED 7/25/90) MAKES ANY PROVISION RELATED TO DEFICIENCY PAYMENTS FOR 1988 AND 1989 CROPS OF BARLEY NONDISCRETIONARY.</p> <p><u>SENATE MODIFIED AMENDMENT 2330</u> (ADOPTED 7/26/90) MODIFIED THE REPAYMENT REQUIREMENTS FOR ADVANCE DEFICIENCY PAYMENTS FOR CERTAIN PRODUCERS.</p>

COMPARISON OF PROPOSALS FOR THE 1990 FARM BILL--AS OF AUGUST 1, 1990

	Administration	House	Senate	Comments
32) What if actual deficiency payment rate is less than projected payment rate?	Not addressed.	Not addressed.	Requires the Secretary to pay producers 20% of the difference between the final deficiency payment rate and the projected deficiency payment rate.	<u>Senate</u> provision could be very costly.
33) Is the deficiency payment rate under 0-50/92 guaranteed at not less than the projected rate?	Yes, for wheat and feed grains only; not for cotton and rice.	Yes, for wheat, feed grains, cotton and rice.	Yes, for wheat, feed grains and cotton; not for rice.	<u>Administration</u> continues current law. <u>House</u> extends guarantee to cotton and rice. <u>Senate</u> guarantees rate to all program crops except rice.
33a) What is the sense of Congress concerning potential reductions in spending?	No addressed.	It is the sense of Congress that any future reduction in spending provided by any budget reconciliation bill that affects agricultural commodity support programs should be made by Congress on a targeted basis to protect the support prices for the amount of commodities produced by family-sized farms. [Sec. 1121]	No such provision.	

COMPARISON OF PROPOSALS FOR THE 1990 FARM BILL--AS OF AUGUST 1, 1990

	Administration	House	Senate	Comments
	CROP ACREAGE BASES (CAB's)			
34) How are CAB's determined?	<p><u>Program Crops and Oilseeds</u>: 5-year moving average (lagged 1 year) of planted and considered planted acreage.</p>	<p><u>Wheat and Feed Grains</u>: 5-year moving average of planted and considered planted acreage.</p> <p><u>Upland Cotton and Rice</u>: 3-year moving average of planted and considered planted acreage.</p> <p><u>ELS Cotton</u>: 3-year moving average (lagged 1 year) of planted and considered planted acreage.</p>	<p><u>Wheat, Feed Grains and Oilseeds</u>: 5-year moving average of planted and considered planted acreage.</p> <p><u>Upland Cotton and Rice</u>: same as for other crops, except if no P&CP is credited for a year, exclude that year in the calculation. The base shall not exceed P&CP for the previous 2 years if no P&CP for any year.</p> <p><u>ELS Cotton</u>: Extends current law.</p>	<p><u>Administration</u> makes base calculation similar for all commodities and lags calculation 1 year to ensure timely notification to producers. <u>Senate</u> maintains current law. <u>House</u> changes cotton and rice calculation to 3-year moving average with no exclusion for years with no P&CP.</p>
35) How is Acreage Conservation Reserve (ACR) calculated?	<p>The result of multiplying the crop acreage base for the program crop by the percentage reduction announced by the Secretary.</p>	<p>The result of multiplying the payment acreage for the crop by the ARP factor.</p>	<p>Same as Administration.</p>	<p><u>Administration</u> and <u>Senate</u> calculate idled acreage as a percent of base to simplify producer understanding of the program. <u>House</u> permits reduction in ACR for underplanting.</p>

COMPARISON OF PROPOSALS FOR THE 1990 FARM BILL--AS OF AUGUST 1, 1990

	Administration	House	Senate	Comments
	PROGRAM PAYMENT YIELDS			
36) How are program yields determined?	Frozen at the 1990 level.	<p>Frozen at the 1990 level, but not less than 90% of 1985 level; or, at Secretary's discretion, can be based on a 5-year moving average, dropping the high and low, of actual yields.</p> <p>For feed grains only, at the option of the producer, the Secretary is required to accept actual yields for the 1986-1990 crop years, dropping the high and low years, to establish payment yields. The Secretary must increase the uniform ARP for feed grains sufficient to offset the cost of using actual yields to establish payment yields.</p>	<p>Frozen at 1990 level, program payment yields, but payment yield can not fall below 90% of 1985 level; or, at Secretary's discretion, program yield can be based on a 5-year moving average, dropping the high and low, of actual harvested yields.</p> <p>Secretary is required to collect actual yield data and maintain it for 5 years.</p>	<p>All three proposals allow the Secretary to freeze payment yields at the 1990 level.</p> <p><u>HOUSE EN BLOC AMENDMENT (ADOPTED 7/25/90)</u> REQUIRES THE SECRETARY TO ALLOW FEED GRAIN PRODUCERS TO USE ACTUAL YIELDS TO ESTABLISH PAYMENT YIELDS, AND TO INCREASE THE ARP TO OFFSET THE ADDITIONAL COST OF HIGHER PAYMENT YIELDS.</p>
37) What yield is used for loan deficiency payments (except for honey)?	No change from current law (based on program yields).	Harvested yield.	Harvested yield.	Current law limits payments to program yield.

COMPARISON OF PROPOSALS FOR THE 1990 FARM BILL--AS OF AUGUST 1, 1990

	Administration	House	Senate	Comments
	HAYING AND GRAZING			
38) What restrictions apply to haying and grazing ACR and CU?	<p>Secretary may allow haying and grazing during designated 7-month period on ACR and CU if he determines such would not have an adverse economic effect.</p> <p>Year-round haying and grazing is authorized under emergency conditions.</p>	<p>Removes Secretarial discretion by requiring haying and grazing during designated 7-month period if State ASC requests such.</p> <p>Same as Administration.</p>	<p>Same as House.</p> <p>Same as Administration.</p>	<p><u>House</u> and <u>Senate</u> prohibit Secretarial discretion to permit haying and grazing during 7-month period.</p> <p><u>HOUSE EN BLOC AMENDMENT (ADOPTED 7/24/90) PROHIBITS THE SECRETARY FROM EXCLUDING IRRIGATED OR IRRIGABLE ACREAGE NOT PLANTED IN ALFALFA FROM HAYING AND GRAZING UNDER EMERGENCY CONDITIONS.</u></p>
	CROSS COMPLIANCE			
39) What restrictions apply to cross compliance?	<p>May be invoked at Secretarial discretion.</p>	<p>Prohibits limited cross compliance and base building unless nonparticipant in all program crops.</p>	<p>Same as House.</p>	<p><u>House</u> and <u>Senate</u> prohibit limited cross compliance, but also prohibit base building by participants. <u>HOUSE EN BLOC AMENDMENT (ADOPTED 7/24/90) ADDED LANGUAGE FOR ELS COTTON SIMILAR TO THAT FOR OTHER COMMODITIES.</u></p>
	FOOD SECURITY WHEAT RESERVE			
40) What rules apply to rebuilding FSWR?	<p>Extends authority for replenishment, but not required.</p>	<p>Requires replacing wheat within 18 months after release, subject to availability or appropriation.</p>	<p>Extends current authority. Adds that if season average wheat price is less than 140% of loan rate, the minimum in the FSWR is 75 million bushels.</p>	<p><u>House</u> and <u>Senate</u> require replenishment within certain guidelines.</p>

COMPARISON OF PROPOSALS FOR THE 1990 FARM BILL--AS OF AUGUST 1, 1990

	Administration	House	Senate	Comments
	MINIMUM CCC SALES POLICY			
41) What restrictions apply to CCC sales?	<p><u>All Commodities:</u> Lower of 110 percent of loan rate or loan repayment rate.</p>	<p><u>Wheat and Feed Grains:</u> When FOR is in effect, not less than 165% of loan rate; When FOR <u>not</u> in effect, not less than 150% of loan rate.</p> <p><u>Cotton and Rice:</u> Lower of 115% of loan rate or loan repayment rate.</p>	<p><u>In General:</u> 115% of the lower of the loan rate or loan repayment level.</p> <p><u>Wheat and Feed Grains:</u> When FOR is in effect, not less than 105% of target.</p> <p><u>Oilseeds:</u> Not less than 105% of loan rate or 115% of loan repayment level.</p> <p><u>Upland Cotton:</u> CCC shall sell for unrestricted use at the same price CCC sells for export, but in no event less than general restriction above.</p> <p><u>Competitive Bid Basis:</u> Subject to sales price restrictions, the Secretary may sell any basic or storable non-basic commodity on a competitive bid basis, if the Secretary determines the sale is appropriate.</p>	<p><u>Administration</u> has the lowest price trigger for CCC sales, while the <u>House</u> has the highest. <u>Senate</u> slightly above level set by <u>Administration</u>.</p> <p>SENATE AMENDMENT 2304 (ADOPTED 7/19/90) ADDED MINIMUM SALES PRICE CRITERIA FOR UPLAND COTTON (UNRESTRICTED USE AT SAME PRICE AS FOR EXPORT), AND THE PROVISION FOR COMPETITIVE BIDS.</p>

COMPARISON OF PROPOSALS FOR THE 1990 FARM BILL--AS OF AUGUST 1, 1990

	Administration	House	Senate	Comments
	FARMER-OWNED RESERVE (FOR)			
42) What rules apply to FOR?	<p><u>Implementation:</u> Not specified.</p> <p><u>Wheat and Feed Grains:</u> <u>Maximum level (mil bu)</u> Wheat 300 Feed Grains 600</p> <p><u>Minimum Level:</u> None.</p> <p><u>Contract Period:</u> 9-12 months, with repayment any time before maturity.</p> <p><u>Storage Stop:</u> Discretionary at 140% of loan rate.</p> <p><u>Storage Payments:</u> fixed in quarterly installments.</p> <p><u>Interest:</u> Discretionary, may be waived by Secretary.</p>	<p><u>Implementation:</u> FOR must be implemented if wheat (feed grain) S/U ratio is greater than 40% (25%).</p> <p><u>Wheat and Feed Grains:</u> <u>Maximum level (mil bu)</u> Wheat 300 Feed Grains 600</p> <p><u>Minimum Level:</u> None required.</p> <p><u>Contract Period:</u> 18 months, plus 6-month extension at producer's option. Repayment any time before maturity.</p> <p><u>Storage Stop:</u> 150 percent of loan rate.</p> <p><u>Storage Payments:</u> To extent possible, pay producers at average commercial rates.</p> <p><u>Interest:</u> Same as Administration. May also permit repayment at less than principal amount of loan.</p>	<p><u>Implementation:</u> FOR must be implemented when supplies are abundant or prices are less than 140% of the loan value.</p> <p><u>Wheat and Feed Grains:</u> <u>Maximum Level</u> Wheat: 300 mil. bu. to 30% of use. Feed Grains: 600 mil. bu. to 15% of use</p> <p><u>Minimum Level:</u> None specified.</p> <p><u>Contract Period:</u> Not less than 3 years, with extensions as warranted. Repayment anytime before maturity.</p> <p><u>Storage Stop:</u> Target price.</p> <p><u>Storage Payments:</u> Comparable to commercial rates, paid at Projected CCC outlays may not increase following adjustments.</p> <p><u>Interest:</u> May charge interest whenever prices equal or greater than target prices.</p>	<p><u>Senate</u> has the largest potential FOR, and would require the longest contract period. <u>House</u> and <u>Senate</u> require storage payments comparable to commercial rates. All proposals would pay storage "after the fact." <u>House</u> language is effective beginning with the 1991 crops.</p> <p><u>HOUSE AMENDMENT</u> (ADOPTED 8/1/90) REQUIRES THAT STORAGE PAYMENTS, TO THE EXTENT PRACTICABLE, TAKE INTO ACCOUNT AVERAGE RATES PAID FOR COMMERCIAL STORAGE IN THE STATE.</p> <p><u>SENATE AMENDMENT</u> 2322 (ADOPTED 7/20/90) REQUIRES THE SECRETARY, TO THE EXTENT PRACTICABLE, TO ENSURE THAT PRODUCER AND AVERAGE COMMERCIAL STORAGE RATES ARE EQUIVALENT, TAKING INTO ACCOUNT THE CURRENT DEMAND FOR STORAGE, EFFICIENCY, LOCATION, REGULATORY COMPLIANCE COSTS, BONDING REQUIREMENTS, AND IMPACT OF USER FEES, EXCEPT THAT CURRENT OR PROJECTED CCC OUTLAYS FOR BOTH COMMERCIAL AND PRODUCER STORAGE MUST NOT INCREASE FOLLOWING THE ADJUSTMENTS.</p>

COMPARISON OF PROPOSALS FOR THE 1990 FARM BILL--AS OF AUGUST 1, 1990

	Administration	House	Senate	Comments
	COMMODITY CERTIFICATES			
43) What rules apply to subsequent holders?	No such provision.	For the first 180 days following enactment of the bill, subsequent holders may redeem up to \$25,000 in certificates under the same rules as original holders. Subsequent holders may not redeem certificates for a price greater than they paid for them, and no expired certificate may be redeemed unless purchased after January 1, 1990.	No such provision.	<u>House</u> grants subsequent holders the same redemption privileges as original holders for a limited time.
44) What options do producers have in receiving certificates?	No such provision.	If the Secretary makes in-kind payments available, <u>wheat and feed grain</u> producers may elect to receive such payments in cash instead of in-kind.	No such provision.	<u>House</u> gives wheat and feed grain producers the option to receive either cash or certificates whenever in-kind payments are available.
45) What about interest payments for cash redemption?	No such provision.	No such provision.	The Secretary shall pay interest on the cash redemption of a commodity certificate held by a producer for at least 150 days.	<u>Senate</u> requires interest payments on cash redemptions if held for at least 150 days.

COMPARISON OF PROPOSALS FOR THE 1990 FARM BILL--AS OF AUGUST 1, 1990

	Administration	House	Senate	Comments
46) What additional requirements must the Secretary follow regarding certificates?	No such provision.	<p>The CCC shall, by rule, establish procedures for the exchange of certificates for commodities or funds of the CCC, including any procedures for determining the value of certificates.</p> <p>As soon as practicable before the marketing year, the Secretary shall announce the anticipated stock disposition actions with respect to certificate exchanges, along with the reasons for such actions. Whenever the Secretary decides to make payments using marketing certificates, he shall announce the rationale for such decisions and the goals for the level of CCC stocks.</p> <p>Whenever the Secretary decides to make payments to producers using marketing certificates, the Secretary shall allow producers to use certificates to make any refund of those payments.</p>	No such provisions.	<u>House</u> requires procedures to be established by rule regarding certain aspects of certificate operation, and requires the Secretary to announce anticipated stock disposition actions and goals regarding certificates. Also allows producers to use certificates to make refunds of overpayments.

COMPARISON OF PROPOSALS FOR THE 1990 FARM BILL--AS OF AUGUST 1, 1990

	Administration	House	Senate	Comments
	PAYMENT LIMITATIONS			
47) What are the requirements?	<p><u>Wheat, Feed Grains, Cotton and Rice:</u> Not addressed.</p>	<p><u>Wheat, Feed Grains, Cotton and Rice:</u> Sets a limit of \$50,000 on deficiency and diversion payments; \$100,000 on marketing loan gains, Findley payments, loan deficiency payments, and, inventory reduction payments; and, a \$200,000 aggregate limit on all aforementioned payments and wool/mohair payments and honey lower loan repayment gains. Persons under the \$50,000 limit are generally defined as under current law. Under the \$100,000 limitation, the Secretary may, effectively, use an attribution of payment approach.</p>	<p><u>Wheat, Feed Grains, Cotton and Rice:</u> Extends current law, except where indicated below.</p>	<p>Senate changes from current law, except where indicated below.</p> <p>HOUSE AMENDMENT (ADOPTED 8/1/90) CHANGES PAYMENT LIMITS FOR COMMODITY PROGRAMS AND REDEFINES PERSONS.</p> <p>Substantial technical issue remains regarding the implementation of the House provision, most notably the treatment of corporations and shareholders with respect to the \$100,000 payments and wool/mohair and honey payments.</p>

COMPARISON OF PROPOSALS FOR THE 1990 FARM BILL--AS OF AUGUST 1, 1990

	Administration	House	Senate	Comments
48) What about spouses?	Not addressed.	Secretary may modify regulations to provide that, with respect to any married couple, the husband and wife shall be considered as one person, except: 1) Same as Senate (1). 2) Same as Senate (2). 3) If following their marriage, either spouse becomes an owner of an unrelated farming operation by way of gift, devise, or descent, such spouse may be treated as a separate person, so long as such spouse provide a significant contribution of management or labor to the acquired operation.	The husband and wife shall be considered one person, except: 1) If prior to marriage, each were engaged in unrelated farming operations and each continues to be operated as a separate operation, then they shall be treated as separate persons for payment limitations. 2) Spouses who do not hold, directly or indirectly, a substantial beneficial interest in more than one entity may be considered separate persons if spouse meets requirements established to be considered as a separate person.	<u>Senate</u> and <u>House</u> add conditions for spouses to be considered separate persons for payment limitation purposes. <u>HOUSE AMENDMENT (ADOPTED 8/1/90)</u> PERMITS SECRETARY TO MODIFY REGULATIONS WITH RESPECT TO ANY MARRIED COUPLE.
49) What about hybrid seed growers?	Not addressed.	In determining whether a person growing hybrid seed under contract is actively engaged in farming, the Secretary cannot take into consideration the existence of a hybrid seed contract.	Same as House.	<u>SENATE AMENDMENT 2304 (ADOPTED 7/19/90)</u> ADDS LANGUAGE SIMILAR TO HOUSE REGARDING HYBRID SEED CONTRACTS.

COMPARISON OF PROPOSALS FOR THE 1990 FARM BILL--AS OF AUGUST 1, 1990

	Administration	House	Senate	Comments
50) What about irrevocable trusts?	Not addressed.	<p>Irrevocable trusts are prohibited from receiving payments. 1/ Such payments include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - deficiency and diversion payments - marketing loan gains - loan deficiency payments - inventory reduction payments - Findley deficiency payments - wool/mohair payments - resource adjustment compensation - disaster payments - honey lower loan repayment gains 	<p>To be considered a separate person for payment purposes, an irrevocable trust (except those established prior to January 1, 1987) must not allow the grantor to modification, terminate, or have any future, contingent, or remainder interest in the trust, or provide for transfer to the remainder beneficiary in less than 20 years. Exceptions are cases where the transfer is contingent on the remainder beneficiary achieving majority or is contingent on the death of the grantor.</p>	<p><u>SENATE AMENDMENT 2339</u> (ADOPTED 7/24/90) REQUIRES IRREVOCABLE TRUSTS TO BE FOR AT LEAST 20 YEARS TO BE CONSIDERED A SEPARATE PERSON FOR PAYMENT PURPOSES.</p> <p><u>HOUSE AMENDMENT</u> (ADOPTED 8-1-90) PROHIBITS AN IRREVOCABLE TRUST FROM BEING ELIGIBLE TO RECEIVE ANY PAYMENTS.</p> <p>1/ The wording of the <u>House</u> amendment is not entirely clear. Based on our understanding the prohibition of payments to irrevocable trusts applies as shown. However, present wording provides that the prohibition applies only to the last three payment items listed.</p>
51) What about minimal beneficial interest?	Not addressed.	Eliminates provision in current law.	Minimal beneficial interest changed from 10 percent to 5 percent.	<p><u>SENATE AMENDMENT 2339</u> (ADOPTED 7/24/90) REDUCED PERCENTAGE FOR MINIMAL BENEFICIAL INTEREST.</p> <p><u>HOUSE AMENDMENT</u> (ADOPTED 8/1/90) ELIMINATES PROVISION OF CURRENT LAW THAT DEALS WITH MINIMAL INTERESTS.</p>

COMPARISON OF PROPOSALS FOR THE 1990 FARM BILL--AS OF AUGUST 1, 1990

	Administration	House	Senate	Comments
52) What additional requirements does the Secretary have concerning payment limitations?	No addressed.	No such provision.	<p>The Secretary must develop a database pertaining to individuals receiving direct payments in excess of \$50,000; and must publish a report 180 days after enactment of the bill, and annually thereafter, which presents data and analysis of payments in excess of \$50,000.</p> <p>The Secretary must submit an annual report to Congress identifying violators of payment limitations.</p> <p>The Secretary must institute training of appropriate personnel for the purpose of fostering more effective and uniform application of the payment limitation.</p> <p>The State ASCS office must make the initial determination concerning the application of established payment limitations and restrictions for farm operations consisting of more than 5 persons, subject to review by the Secretary.</p>	SENATE AMENDMENT 2339 (ADOPTED 7/24/90) ADDS ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS FOR THE SECRETARY IN REGARDS TO PAYMENT LIMITATIONS.

COMPARISON OF PROPOSALS FOR THE 1990 FARM BILL--AS OF AUGUST 1, 1990

	Administration	House	Senate	Comments
	WOOL AND MOHAIR PROVISIONS			
53) How are payments determined?	Current parity-based payments changed to target price/deficiency payment concept. Target set at 90% of 1985 support prices, adjusted in subsequent years commensurate with other commodity targets.	Extends current law without change.	For each of the 1991-1995 marketing years, the established price for wool shall be \$1.82 per pound, and the established price for mohair shall be \$4.532 per pound.	<u>House</u> extends current law. <u>Administration</u> proposed moving to a target price concept. <u>SENATE AMENDMENT 2388 (ADOPTED 7/26/90)</u> FREEZES THE ESTABLISHED PRICE OF WOOL AND MOHAIR FOR THE 1991-1995 MARKETING YEARS.
54) Do payment limitations apply?	Wool/Mohair payments subject to combined \$250,000 limit per person.	Per person limitation on National Wool Act payments, as follows: \$200,000 in 1991, \$167,000 in 1992, \$133,000 in 1993, and \$100,000 in 1994-95.	\$250,000 per person limitation on wool/mohair payments.	<u>SENATE AMENDMENT 2388 (ADOPTED 7/26/90)</u> INCREASED THE PAYMENT LIMITATION FROM \$50,000 TO \$250,000. <u>HOUSE AMENDMENT (ADOPTED 7/25/90)</u> ESTABLISHED A DECLINING PAYMENT LIMITATION FOR WOOL AND MOHAIR FOR THE 1991-1995 MARKETING YEARS.
	SUGAR PROGRAM PROVISIONS			
55) What is the loan rate for sugar?	Not addressed.	<u>Cane Sugar</u> : Minimum of 18 cents/lb, with authority to increase loan rate based on cost of production and other factors. <u>Beet Sugar</u> : Loan rate based on the weighted averages of the most recent 5 years of producer returns for sugar beets relative to sugar cane.	<u>Cane Sugar</u> : Same as House. <u>Beet Sugar</u> : Loan rate at level Secretary determines is fair and reasonable in relation to loan rate for cane sugar.	<u>Senate</u> same as current law. <u>House</u> provisions would result in higher loan rate.

COMPARISON OF PROPOSALS FOR THE 1990 FARM BILL--AS OF AUGUST 1, 1990

	Administration	House	Senate	Comments
56) What is the period for the loan?	Not addressed.	<p>9-month loan period.</p> <p>Provision for supplementary loan in addition to initial loan for areas that harvest sugarbeets in the last three months of the fiscal year.</p> <p>Initial loan will be paid by end of fiscal year</p> <p>Supplementary loan (1) will be available on first day of following fiscal year and be made at the same rate as the initial loan; and (2) will mature in 9 months less the amount of time the initial loan was in effect.</p>	Same as in House.	Sugar program currently administered with 6 month loans. <u>House</u> and <u>Senate</u> provisions raise the market stabilizing price (MSP).
57) What are the quota provisions?	Not addressed.	President may establish, for any quota year beginning after September 1990, a tariff rate quota. Minimum level of 1.25 million short tons annually.	No such provision.	<u>House</u> : Finding of Congress that (1) conversion of current regime of import quotas to tariff rate quotas would comply with our international obligations under GATT, and (2) a GATT-consistent regime of regulating sugar imports should be implemented not later than October 1, 1990.
58) What are the reporting requirements?	Not addressed.	Requires monthly reporting by cane refiners, beet processors, and crystalline fructose manufacturers, and by USDA concerning imports, distribution and stock levels.	No such provision.	

COMPARISON OF PROPOSALS FOR THE 1990 FARM BILL--AS OF AUGUST 1, 1990

	Administration	House	Senate	Comments
59) What about acreage base for sugarcane?	Not addressed.	Base acreage for sugarcane shall be the weighted average of acreage harvested on the farm for sugar or seed in each of the previous five years, with the most recent year receiving the lowest weight, and vice versa.	No such provision.	HOUSE AMENDMENT (ADOPTED 7/24/90) REVISES THE METHOD OF CALCULATING BASE ACREAGE FOR SUGAR SO THAT BASE WILL BE A SIMPLE 5-YEAR MOVING AVERAGE (EQUAL WEIGHTS FOR EACH YEAR) INSTEAD OF A 5-YEAR WEIGHTED AVERAGE WITH LOWEST WEIGHT ON THE MOST RECENT YEAR, AND VICE VERSA.
60) What about marketing allotments for sugar?	Not addressed.	<p>Requires Secretary to establish marketing allotments for sugar processed from domestically produced sugarcane and sugar beets to maintain imports of not less than 1.25 million short tons.</p> <p>Prohibits processors from marketing, including pledging as loan collateral, any sugar in excess of the processor's marketing allotment.</p> <p>Requires proportionate sharing of allotments among producers of sugarcane in those States that have in excess of 250 producers.</p>	<p>No such provision.</p> <p>No such provision.</p> <p>No such provision.</p>	

COMPARISON OF PROPOSALS FOR THE 1990 FARM BILL--AS OF AUGUST 1, 1990

	Administration	House	Senate	Comments
60a) What about the import treatment of sugars, syrups, and molasses?	Not addressed.	The President may establish for any quota year beginning after September 30, 1990, a tariff-rate quota on sugars, syrups, and molasses, unless the U.S. Trade Representative determines that such a tariff would be inconsistent with any obligations of the United States under any trade agreement. In setting the tariff, the interests of domestic sugar producers and consumers, and GATT contracting parties must be given due consideration. USTR shall allocate among supplier countries their share of the tariff-rate quota established for the tariff year. No rate of duty in excess of \$0.40/kg may be imposed on sugars, syrups, or molasses that are the product of a supplier country but are not certified as being within the allocation made for that country. The Secretary and USTR are both authorized to issue regulations necessary to carry out the tariff-rate quotas. [Secs. 221-227]	No such provision.	The purpose of the <u>House</u> provision is to provide for the implementation on October 1, 1990, of tariff-rate quotas on imports of sugar, syrups, and molasses that are consistent with the international obligations of the United States.

COMPARISON OF PROPOSALS FOR THE 1990 FARM BILL--AS OF AUGUST 1, 1990

	Administration	House	Senate	Comments
61) Are there any requirements for a study?	Not addressed.	Requires Comptroller General of U.S. on progress made by Government in addressing concerns raised by a GAO report on imports of sugar-containing products.	No such provision.	
61a) What about distortions to world trade?	Not addressed.	No such provision.	The General Accounting Office shall, no later than October 31, 1990, report to Congress recommendations for policies the United States can adopt to improve and enhance developing countries' access to world sugar markets and reduce other distortions to world sugar trade.	
HONEY PROGRAM PROVISIONS				
62) What type of program is proposed for honey?	Income support program.	For 1991-95 crops, supported through loans, purchases, or other operations.	For 1991-94 crops, price supported by loans, purchases, or other operations as Secretary deems appropriate. <u>For 1995 and subsequent crops</u> , price no longer supported.	<u>SENATE AMENDMENT 2337</u> (ADOPTED 7/24/90) DROPS THE HONEY SUPPORT PROVISIONS AFTER FOUR YEARS.
63) What is the target price for honey?	Set at 1990 loan rate and adjusted with other commodity targets.	None.	Secretary's discretion for 1991-94 crops.	<u>Administration</u> changes program from loan to target/deficiency payment concept comparable to other commodities.

COMPARISON OF PROPOSALS FOR THE 1990 FARM BILL--AS OF AUGUST 1, 1990

	Administration	House	Senate	Comments
64) What is the loan rate for honey?	Set at 75-85 percent of the average market price during previous 5 years, excluding high and low.	Loan rate set at 53.8 cents/lb. for the 1991-1995 crop years.	Subject to Secretary's discretion for 1991-94 crops.	<u>HOUSE</u> AMENDMENT (ADOPTED 8/1/90) FREEZES THE LOAN RATE AT THE 1990 LEVEL. <u>Administration</u> sets loan formula similar to other commodities.
65) What is the loan repayment level for honey?	Provision for a loan repayment rate below the loan rate at Secretary's discretion, to prevent forfeitures, save Government costs and maintain market competitiveness of honey.	Same as Administration, except doesn't extend authority for loan deficiency payments.	Subject to Secretary's discretion for 1991-94 crops.	<u>Administration</u> contains authority for loan deficiency payments on actual production.
66) What payment limitations apply to honey?	Combined \$250,000 limit on loan repayment gains and payments.	Combined limitation on loan forfeitures and any payments set at: \$200,000 in 1991, \$167,000 in 1992, \$133,000 in 1993, and \$100,000 in 1994-95 which is included in an overall \$200,000 maximum limitation.	Same as current law.	<u>HOUSE</u> AMENDMENT (ADOPTED 8/1/90) REDUCES LOAN FORFEITURE LIMIT FOR HONEY OVER TIME. Payment/forfeiture limitation language as it relates to honey is not clear.

COMPARISON OF PROPOSALS FOR THE 1990 FARM BILL--AS OF AUGUST 1, 1990

	Administration	House	Senate	Comments												
	DAIRY PROGRAM PROVISIONS															
67) What is the support price level for milk?	<p>Continue to tie the price support level to projected surplus. Provide more flexibility to reflect market conditions when setting support prices.</p> <table><tr><th>Projected Surplus (Bil lbs)</th><th>Price Adjustment (\$/cwt)</th></tr><tr><td>< 2.5</td><td>+.25 to +.50</td></tr><tr><td>2.51- 5.0</td><td>-.25 to +.25</td></tr><tr><td>5.01- 7.5</td><td>-.25 to -.50</td></tr><tr><td>7.51-10.0</td><td>-.50 to -.75</td></tr><tr><td>>10.0</td><td>-1.00</td></tr></table>	Projected Surplus (Bil lbs)	Price Adjustment (\$/cwt)	< 2.5	+.25 to +.50	2.51- 5.0	-.25 to +.25	5.01- 7.5	-.25 to -.50	7.51-10.0	-.50 to -.75	>10.0	-1.00	<p>Minimum of \$10.10 as of Jan. 1, 1991 - Dec. 31, 1995.</p> <p>Price support level raised at least \$0.25 on <u>Oct. 1</u> of 1991 through 1995, if annual surplus is projected less than 3.5 billion pounds, milk equivalent, total solids basis.</p> <p>Lowered \$0.25-\$0.50 (but not less than \$10.10) on <u>Oct. 1</u> of 1992 through 1995, if annual surplus is projected to exceed 5.0 billion pounds.</p> <p>Both Agriculture Committees must be notified by <u>Aug. 1</u> of any change in price to occur Oct. 1.</p>	<p>Same as House.</p> <p>Same as House, except action taken on <u>Jan. 1</u>.</p> <p>Same as House, except action taken on <u>Jan. 1</u>.</p> <p>Both Committees must be notified by <u>Nov. 1</u> of any change in price to occur <u>Jan. 1</u>.</p>	<p><u>Administration</u> allows for greater flexibility in adjusting milk support prices. <u>House</u> and <u>Senate</u> have similar provisions, except that the price support may not drop below current levels.</p>
Projected Surplus (Bil lbs)	Price Adjustment (\$/cwt)															
< 2.5	+.25 to +.50															
2.51- 5.0	-.25 to +.25															
5.01- 7.5	-.25 to -.50															
7.51-10.0	-.50 to -.75															
>10.0	-1.00															

COMPARISON OF PROPOSALS FOR THE 1990 FARM BILL--AS OF AUGUST 1, 1990

	Administration	House	Senate	Comments																
68) Are CCC purchase prices specified?	No.	<p>The purchase price for butter for the <u>fiscal</u> year shall not exceed:</p> <table><tr><td><u>Fiscal Year</u></td><td><u>Price/Lb.</u></td></tr><tr><td>1991</td><td>\$0.9825</td></tr><tr><td>1992 & 1993</td><td>\$0.8150</td></tr><tr><td>1994 & 1995</td><td>\$0.7875</td></tr></table> <p>An exception allows butter purchase prices to exceed above rates if it will result in the lowest level of expenditures by CCC.</p> <p>Both Agriculture Committees must be notified if the Secretary intends to raise butter prices above specified rates.</p>	<u>Fiscal Year</u>	<u>Price/Lb.</u>	1991	\$0.9825	1992 & 1993	\$0.8150	1994 & 1995	\$0.7875	<p>The purchase price for butter for the <u>calendar</u> year shall not exceed:</p> <table><tr><td><u>Calendar Year</u></td><td><u>Price/Lb.</u></td></tr><tr><td>1991</td><td>\$0.983</td></tr><tr><td>1992 & 1993</td><td>\$0.815</td></tr><tr><td>1994 & 1995</td><td>\$0.788</td></tr></table> <p>Same provision as House, but in addition, the Secretary may consider other appropriate factors..</p> <p>Same as House.</p>	<u>Calendar Year</u>	<u>Price/Lb.</u>	1991	\$0.983	1992 & 1993	\$0.815	1994 & 1995	\$0.788	<p>Purchase price for butter similar between <u>House</u> and <u>Senate</u>, but differ as to time period each rate applies (fiscal vs. calendar year).</p> <p>These butter price reductions require an offsetting increase in the CCC purchase price of nonfat dry milk.</p> <p><u>HOUSE AMENDMENT (ADOPTED 8/1/90)</u> CHANGES PURCHASE PRICE FOR BUTTER IN FY 1991 FROM \$0.8150 TO \$0.9825 PER POUND.</p>
<u>Fiscal Year</u>	<u>Price/Lb.</u>																			
1991	\$0.9825																			
1992 & 1993	\$0.8150																			
1994 & 1995	\$0.7875																			
<u>Calendar Year</u>	<u>Price/Lb.</u>																			
1991	\$0.983																			
1992 & 1993	\$0.815																			
1994 & 1995	\$0.788																			
69) How is the milk equivalent of CCC purchases determined?	Not specified.	<p>The milk equivalent of surplus dairy products purchased by CCC shall be measured on a total solids basis, equal to the weighted average of the milk equivalents, on a milkfat and a nonfat solids basis. The milk equivalent of nonfat solids shall not be weighted more than 70%, nor the milk equivalent of milkfat more than 40%.</p>	Same as House.	<p><u>HOUSE AMENDMENT (ADOPTED 8/1/90)</u> STRIKES REQUIREMENT TO ISSUE PROPOSED FORMULAS WITHIN 30 DAYS OF ENACTMENT AND A FINAL RULE WITHIN 90 DAYS OF ENACTMENT.</p>																

COMPARISON OF PROPOSALS FOR THE 1990 FARM BILL--AS OF AUGUST 1, 1990

	Administration	House	Senate	Comments
70) Are there adjustments to CCC purchase levels which trigger program action?	No.	Exclude any increase in imports of dairy products from the 1986-90 average, on a total solids basis, from projection of annual surplus.	Same as House.	Should imports increase, <u>House</u> and <u>Senate</u> allows greater accumulation of surplus before triggering program action.
71) Is supply management provided?	No.	<p>Within 180 days of enactment, the Secretary shall submit to both Agriculture Committees, a report recommending a supply management program.</p> <p>Two-tier pricing plans must be evaluated. Termination or diversion programs and use of assessments as a mechanism to decrease price support levels are excluded from the study.</p> <p>The supply management program must be implemented for any fiscal year 1992 through 1995 (but not before Jan. 1, 1992) if CCC purchases are projected to exceed 6.0 billion pounds.</p> <p>The Secretary may not enter into contract with any dairy farmer for the purpose of selling <u>any</u> dairy cattle for slaughter.</p>	<p>Within 90 days after enactment, the Secretary shall request proposals concerning a milk marketing adjustment program. Within 180 days after request, the Secretary shall evaluate them according to listed criteria. By July 1, 1991, after opportunity for public comment, the Secretary shall submit to both Agriculture Committees, a report with recommendations.</p> <p>Implement the milk marketing adjustment program on Jan. 1 for any year that CCC purchases are projected to exceed 7.0 billion pounds.</p> <p>Similar to House, except the Secretary may enter into contracts with a dairy farmer to sell live dairy cattle for export.</p>	<p>The Secretary must implement a supply management program if CCC purchases are projected to exceed specified levels.</p> <p>Exclusions from study by <u>House</u> leaves few options other than a two-tier pricing program.</p> <p>A large degree of Congressional oversight is included in both <u>House</u> and <u>Senate</u> bills.</p> <p>HOUSE AMENDMENT (ADOPTED 7/25/90) REDUCES THE LEVEL OF DAIRY SURPLUS THAT TRIGGER IMPLEMENTATION OF AN INVENTORY MANAGEMENT PROGRAM FROM 7 BILLION POUNDS TO 6 BILLION POUNDS.</p> <p>SENATE AMENDMENT 2357 (ADOPTED 7/25/90) ALLOWS SECRETARY TO ENTER INTO A CONTRACT TO SELL LIVE DAIRY CATTLE FOR EXPORT.</p>

COMPARISON OF PROPOSALS FOR THE 1990 FARM BILL--AS OF AUGUST 1, 1990

	Administration	House	Senate	Comments
72) Are state milk manufacturing margins addressed?	No provision.	No state may use a greater allowance than that provided for in Federal programs to establish a Grade A price for milk for manufacturing butter, nonfat milk, or cheese.	No state may use a greater allowance than that provided for in Federal programs to establish a Grade A price for milk for manufacturing butter, nonfat milk, or cheese.	<u>Senate and House</u> would prohibit situations such as higher make allowances in California. <u>HOUSE AMENDMENT (ADOPTED 7/24/90)</u> REPLACED ORIGINAL REQUIREMENT FOR A STUDY OF STATE MAKE ALLOWANCES WITH LANGUAGE IDENTICAL TO SENATE PROHIBITING MAKE ALLOWANCES GREATER THAN THAT PROVIDED FOR IN FEDERAL PROGRAMS.
73) Can whey values be considered in setting the CCC purchase price for cheese?	No provision.	The Department is prohibited from considering any market value of whey in the calculation of the support purchase price for cheese.	Identical to House.	Both <u>House</u> and <u>Senate</u> would prohibit use of whey values in setting CCC purchase price for cheese.
74) Is there an extension of the Dairy Indemnity Program?	No.	Extends availability of indemnity payments to dairy farmers through 1995.	Similar to House.	Both <u>House</u> and <u>Senate</u> would extend the Dairy Indemnity Program. <u>Administration</u> would not.

COMPARISON OF PROPOSALS FOR THE 1990 FARM BILL--AS OF AUGUST 1, 1990

	Administration	House	Senate	Comments
75) Are specific level of export sales of dairy products called for?	Recommends that specific levels of CCC dairy export sales should not be mandated.	Continues through FY 1995 current mandates for CCC export sales of not less than 150,000 metric tons of dairy products (not less than 100,000 MT of butter and not less than 20,000 MT of cheese) if it will not interfere with usual marketings of the U.S. not disrupt world price and normal patterns of commercial trade. Notwithstanding above, mandates export sales of at least 184 million pounds of butter in FY91 without regard for the effect of such sales upon world prices of agricultural commodities or normal patterns of commercial trade.	Extends current mandate through 1995.	<u>Administration</u> does not recommend continuation of program; both <u>House</u> and <u>Senate</u> do. <u>HOUSE AMENDMENT (ADOPTED 8/1/90)</u> STATES SECRETARY SHALL SELL FOR EXPORT AT LEAST 184 MILLION POUNDS OF BUTTER IN FY91 WITHOUT REGARD FOR THE EFFECT ON WORLD PRICES.
76) Is the authority for the Dairy Export Incentive Program extended?	Recommends against continuation of the DEIP.	Extends program authority through 1995.	Identical to House.	
76a) Are there any reporting requirements?	No such provision.	The Secretary shall make available to the public quarterly evaluations of the acquisition and disposal of CCC purchases of dairy products.	Same as <u>House</u> .	

COMPARISON OF PROPOSALS FOR THE 1990 FARM BILL--AS OF AUGUST 1, 1990

	Administration	House	Senate	Comments
76b) What about the application of amendments?	No such provision.	The amendments made by this title shall not affect the liability of any person under section 201 of the 1949 Act as in effect before the date of enactment.	Same as <u>House</u> .	
77) Seasonal Incentive Plan for Dairy	Extends authorities for seasonal base plans and takeout-payback plans	Extends authority which encourages a more even seasonal pattern of milk production throughout the year and encourages dairy farmers to tailor their seasonal pattern of milk output to more nearly meet market demand.	Same as <u>House</u> provision.	All three are consistent.
78) Producer-Handler Status	No such provision.	Specifies that the legal status of producer-handlers under Federal milk orders will be the same as it was before the amendments to this Act became effective.	Same as <u>House</u> provision.	Original intent of <u>House</u> and <u>Senate</u> provisions was to safeguard producer-handlers from provisions of class I base plans. However, the authority for such plans expired December 31, 1981.
79) Revised Pricing Standard	No such provision.	Makes it explicit that prices in federal milk orders should be set at levels not only to insure adequate supplies of high quality milk currently, but that price levels established should be such as to assure a level of farm income adequate to maintain the productive capacity in dairying needed to meet anticipated future needs.	Same as <u>House</u> provision.	Similar <u>House</u> and <u>Senate</u> provisions have been in effect since 1973. It has not affected USDA decisionmaking process because production capacity has always been considered in setting prices under milk orders.

COMPARISON OF PROPOSALS FOR THE 1990 FARM BILL--AS OF AUGUST 1, 1990

	Administration	House	Senate	Comments
80) Mandatory Amendment Hearing	No such provision.	Requires the Secretary to call a public hearing on proposed order amendments if requested by at least one-third of the producers in market who petition individually in writing.	Same as <u>House</u> provision.	Extends current law.
81) National Federal Milk Order Hearing	Has initiated hearing process.	Requires the Secretary to conclude hearings on possible changes in the pricing provisions of milk marketing orders by January 1, 1992.	No such provision.	<u>House</u> provision would set a deadline as to when public hearings would conclude.
82) Minnesota-Wisconsin Price Series Study	Has initiated study.	Requires the Secretary to publish by October 1, 1991, a proposed replacement to the Minnesota-Wisconsin price series used in Federal milk orders, to publish a final rule at the end of a 30-day comment period, and to implement within 30 legislative days after publication of the final rule.	Requires the Secretary to report to Congress by October 1, 1991, on a study of alternatives to the Minnesota-Wisconsin price series, and if the Secretary determines that changes should be made, to provide for public comment on any such change.	The industry has requested a 1-year test of alternatives. A study is underway. <u>House</u> conflicts with 1937 statute requiring formal rulemaking and producer voting.
83) Milk Component Pricing	No such provision.	Allows price adjustments for milk components to be different for producers than for handlers.	Same as <u>House</u> provision.	This provision was sought by the coops to allow producer prices to be adjusted for milk components with no comparable adjustment to handler prices.
84) Fluid Milk Promotion	No such provision.	No such provision.	Establishes a processor-funded fluid milk promotion program.	The <u>Senate</u> sets up a processor-funded fluid milk promotion program that would partially overlap the existing producer-funded dairy promotion program.

COMPARISON OF PROPOSALS FOR THE 1990 FARM BILL--AS OF AUGUST 1, 1990

	Administration	House	Senate	Comments
85) Study of Milk Component Pricing	No such provision.	No such provision.	Requires USDA to initiate a study to determine whether milkfat is being produced in the U.S. in excess of commercial markets.	The number of studies, reports, and surveys should be held to manageable levels.
86) Location Adjustments	No such provision.	Allows price adjustments at a given plant location to be different for handlers than for producers.	Same as <u>House</u> provision.	This provision was sought by the coops to increase their flexibility in allocating milk hauling costs among their members.
87) Dairy Producer Trust (Amendment to Packers and Stockyards Act)	No such provision.	Establishes a dairy trust and provides for amendments to the Packers and Stockyards Act to establish a trust for the benefit of unpaid milk producers similar to that for livestock and poultry producers.	Requires the Secretary in consultation with Packers and Stockyards Administration, Agricultural Marketing Service, Agricultural Cooperative Service, and representatives of the dairy and agricultural lending industries to conduct a study of the need for and impact of the establishment of a federal producer trust.	The <u>House</u> provision establishes a trust. The <u>Senate</u> provision requires a study as to whether such a trust would be needed and possible impacts such a trust would have. The statutory trust provision under the Packers & Stockyards Act has been very successful in assuring payment protection to livestock and poultry producers. Milk producers would also prefer similar protection as provided for in the <u>House</u> provision.

COMPARISON OF PROPOSALS FOR THE 1990 FARM BILL--AS OF AUGUST 1, 1990

	Administration	House	Senate	Comments
	PEANUT PROGRAM PROVISIONS			
88) What is the minimum National poundage quota?	1,100,000 tons	1,350,000 tons	1,350,000 tons	<u>House</u> and <u>Senate</u> increases minimum quota level.
89) How is the National poundage quota established?	Equal to quantity of peanuts estimated by the Secretary to be used for domestic edible, seed, and related uses in each marketing year. No acreage allotments.	Same as Administration.	Same as Administration, except the Secretary may make adjustments for carryover and under marketings if such adjustments will not result in additional outlays or CCC losses.	<u>Senate</u> provides the Secretary with the most flexibility.
90) How is the support price for quota peanuts established?	The 1991 support price is set at 90% of the 1985 loan rate. Thereafter, support price will be adjusted commensurate with target prices of target price commodities.	For the 1991-1995 crops, the price support level for the preceding crop year will be adjusted to reflect any increase in average cost of production (excluding changes in cost of land) during preceding year, except increase from one crop to the next may not exceed 6%.	For the 1991 crop, the increase is calculated the same as in the House, except increase may not exceed 8%. No increase for 1992 and 1994 crops. The 1993 and 1995 increases will reflect changes in the national average cost of peanut production, less land costs, for the two immediately preceding years. Increase attributed to each of the two years will not exceed 4%.	<u>House</u> is an extension of current law. Both <u>House</u> and <u>Senate</u> will continue modest CCC costs.



COMPARISON OF PROPOSALS FOR THE 1990 FARM BILL--AS OF AUGUST 1, 1990

	Administration	House	Senate	Comments
91) How is the support price for additional peanuts established?	Set at such level as the Secretary finds appropriate, taking into consideration the demand for peanut oil and meal, prices of other vegetable oils and meals, and foreign demand for peanuts, but at a level to ensure no loss to CCC.	Same as Administration.	Same as Administration.	No change in current law.
92) What would be the latest date handlers could sign contracts with producers for the sale of additional peanuts?	Handlers may contract with producers of additional peanuts to buy such peanuts for crushing or export. contract must be signed and submitted to the Secretary for approval by August 1.	Same as Administration.	Similar to Administration, except deadline is December 16.	Current law specifies August 1.
93) May quotas be sold or leased to any producer?	Yes, would eliminate sale and lease restrictions.	No, only a farm within the county where the quota was located. If a State has a combined quota of less than 10,000 tons, may be sold or leased to any farm within the State.	Same as House.	<u>House</u> and <u>Senate</u> are the same as current law.
94) How are State quota increases distributed?	Increases are allocated equally to all farms with quota and other farms with peanut production during at least 2 of the 3 preceding years.	Same as Administration except: allocated proportionately based on farm production history for 3 immediately preceding years. Special provisions for Texas.	Same as House.	

COMPARISON OF PROPOSALS FOR THE 1990 FARM BILL--AS OF AUGUST 1, 1990

	Administration	House	Senate	Comments
94) What about using peanuts for experimental purposes?	No such provision.	The Secretary may permit a portion of the poundage quota for peanuts apportioned to any State to be allocated from such State's quota reserve to land-grant institutions, 1890 colleges, including Tuskegee Institute, and USDA/ARS to be used for experimental and research purposes in an amount equal to that amount held by each such institution during 1985 up to 0.001% of such State's basic quota.	The Secretary may permit a portion of the poundage quota for peanuts apportioned to any State to be used for experimental and research purposes by land-grant colleges and universities, and USDA/ARS.	The <u>Senate</u> language does not explicitly mention 1890 colleges (including Tuskegee Institute) as eligible for a portion of the poundage quota to be used for experimental or research purposes.

COMPARISON OF PROPOSALS FOR THE 1990 FARM BILL--AS OF AUGUST 1, 1990

	Administration	House	Senate	Comments
96) What are the terms and conditions for the program?	No such provision.	No such provision.	Producers shall: 1) enter into a binding agreement with the Secretary; 2) not plant program commodities for harvest in excess of normal crop acreage; and, 3) be considered to have complied with acreage reduction program even though acreage planted on the farm exceeds the permitted acreage.	
97) What happens with excess production?	No such provision.	No such provision.	Any quantity of wheat or feed grains produced in excess of the production limitation quantity <u>shall</u> be stored by producers for a period not to exceed 5 years. This excess stored production may be released in a subsequent year if (1) under production of the producer limitation quantity occurs, or (2) producers participating in an ARP or land diversion program (released quantity equal to expected production from the ARP or PLD acreage).	



COMPARISON OF PROPOSALS FOR THE 1990 FARM BILL--AS OF AUGUST 1, 1990

	Administration	House	Senate	Comments
96) What are the terms and conditions for the program?	No such provision.	No such provision.	Producers shall: 1) enter into a binding agreement with the Secretary; 2) not plant program commodities for harvest in excess of normal crop acreage; and, 3) be considered to have complied with acreage reduction program even though acreage planted on the farm exceeds the permitted acreage.	
97) What happens with excess production?	No such provision.	No such provision.	Any quantity of wheat or feed grains produced in excess of the production limitation quantity <u>shall</u> be stored by producers for a period not to exceed 5 years. This excess stored production may be released in a subsequent year if (1) under production of the producer limitation quantity occurs, or (2) producers participating in an ARP or land diversion program (released quantity equal to expected production from the ARP or PLD acreage).	

COMPARISON OF PROPOSALS FOR THE 1990 FARM BILL--AS OF AUGUST 1, 1990

	Administration	House	Senate	Comments
98) What about offering the Pilot program for the 1993-1995 crops?	No such provision.	No such provision.	GAO required to make a study and present recommendations concerning whether the pilot program should be made available to all producers of each of the 1993 through 1995 crops of wheat and feed grains.	
	OPTIONS PILOT PROGRAM			
99) Purpose and description.	No such provision.	No such provision.	The Secretary is required to conduct necessary research to ascertain whether futures options trading would provide reasonable protection to producers from market fluctuations and whether producers would accept and fully utilize this method of price protection. The Secretary must conduct a pilot program for each of the 1991-1995 crops of corn, and for each of the 1993-1995 crops of wheat and soybeans. The pilot program in 1991 must be carried out in at least 3 counties in at least 3 major corn producing States. Additional States may be added later.	<u>SENATE AMENDMENT 2304 (ADOPTED 7/19/90) REAUTHORIZED THE OPTIONS PILOT PROGRAM.</u>

COMPARISON OF PROPOSALS FOR THE 1990 FARM BILL--AS OF AUGUST 1, 1990

	Administration	House	Senate	Comments
	ADMINISTRATIVE APPEALS			
100) What is the general procedure for appeals?	No such provision.	No such provision.	Any participant may appeal an adverse determination as follows: county committee determinations appealed to State committee; State committee determinations appealed to the National Appeals Division; determinations by any other employee or agent of ASCS or CCC may appeal to the National Appeals Division.	SENATE AMENDMENT 2379 (ADOPTED 7/26/90) CHANGES THE ADMINISTRATIVE APPEALS PROCESS FOR ASCS DETERMINATIONS.

COMPARISON OF PROPOSALS FOR THE 1990 FARM BILL--AS OF AUGUST 1, 1990

	Administration	House	Senate	Comments
101) How is the National Appeals Division organized?	No such provision.	No such provision.	The Secretary shall establish a National Appeals Division (NAD) within ASCS, consisting of a director, hearing officers, and other necessary administrative personnel, all of whom are employees of USDA and have no other duties other than hearing and determining formal appeals. Hearing officers shall hear each appeal. The director of NAD has broad powers to have access to all necessary records, audits, etc., and to subpoena witnesses or documents. All hearing officers within NAD shall report to the principal officers within the division and shall not be under the direction or control or receive administrative support from officers other than NAD.	

COMPARISON OF PROPOSALS FOR THE 1990 FARM BILL--AS OF AUGUST 1, 1990

	Administration	House	Senate	Comments
102) What is the general procedure for hearings?	No such provision.	No such provision.	Hearings are held at a time and place designated by the NAD. Participants shall be advised of the issues involved and be given a full opportunity to present facts and information relevant to the matter at issue. The hearing officer may exclude irrelevant information. The hearing must be recorded verbatim and a transcript of the hearing made available, along with copies of all documents and evidence submitted.	

COMPARISON OF PROPOSALS FOR THE 1990 FARM BILL--AS OF AUGUST 1, 1990

	Administration	House	Senate	Comments
103) What is the procedure for review of decisions?	No such provision.	No such provision.	<p>The director of NAD shall make all determinations with respect to appeals submitted to the division, based on the certified record received from the hearing officer. The director of NAD may order further proceedings.</p> <p>Determinations of the director shall be final, conclusive, and binding on USDA, CCC, and any agency thereof. Final decisions of USDA are reviewable by a US court of competent jurisdiction. Nothing shall preclude the Secretary, Administrator of ASCS, or the Executive Vice President of CCC from making a determination or reversing any determination made by a State or county committee or by the director of NAD.</p> <p>Decisions of State or county committees, unless otherwise appealed, shall be final within 90 days, and no action shall be taken to recover amounts disbursed in error.</p>	
104) What is the effective date for the appeals procedure?	No such provision.	No such provision.	Procedures shall not apply to any appeal or proceeding underway prior to enactment of this Act.	

COMPARISON OF PROPOSALS FOR THE 1990 FARM BILL--AS OF AUGUST 1, 1990

	Administration	House	Senate	Comments
105) What about farmers acting in good faith on advice from USDA?	No such provision.	No such provision.	The Secretary may make price support or other payments available to farmers who have, in attempting to comply with programs, taken actions in good faith in reliance on the advice of an authorized representative of the Secretary. The Secretary may provide such support to the extent such farmer has been injured by the good faith reliance, and may require the farmer to take necessary action designed to remedy any failure to comply.	Clarifies existing authority in light of recent U.S. Supreme Court case.
COMMODITY-RELATED STUDIES REQUIRED BY THE SECRETARY				
106) Survey of Program Participants	No such provision.	The Secretary shall survey producers during sign-up for commodity programs in the 1991 calendar year regarding their preference for the redistribution of any crop acreage base on each producer's farm. Analysis of results must be reported to Congress by January 31, 1992.	No such provision.	<u>House</u> provision would require a survey of producers as to their preference to redistribute bases among existing program crops on the farm, among program crops which the producer currently does not have a base, or any combination of the two.

COMPARISON OF PROPOSALS FOR THE 1990 FARM BILL--AS OF AUGUST 1, 1990

	Administration	House	Senate	Comments
107) Effects of multilateral elimination of agricultural trade limitations.	No such provision.	No such provision.	The Secretary shall conduct a study of the effects of multilateral elimination by all Western Hemisphere nations of tariffs, quotas, marketing orders, quality standards, and other limitations on agricultural trade. The report is due to Congress no later than 1 year after enactment of this Act.	<u>SENATE</u> AMENDMENT 2420 (ADOPTED 7/27/90) PROVIDED FOR A STUDY CONCERNING THE EFFECTS OF MULTILATERAL ELIMINATION OF AGRICULTURAL TRADE LIMITATIONS.
108) Financial impact of support levels.	No such provision.	The Secretary shall conduct an annual assessment of the financial impact of the support levels announced for the various program crops. The assessment should include the effect of such support levels on the ability of producers to meet their financial obligations (esp. for FmHA and FCA). Report due to Congress no later than the date of the final announcement for programs for that marketing year. The results of the assessment are for informational and oversight purposes only, and are not to be the basis for any administrative or judicial proceedings.	No such provision.	<u>House</u> requires an annual report on the financial impact of support levels for program crops, due each year on the date of the final announcement for programs for that marketing year.

COMPARISON OF PROPOSALS FOR THE 1990 FARM BILL--AS OF AUGUST 1, 1990

	Administration	House	Senate	Comments
109) Barley feed value determination.	No such provision.	No such provision.	Prior to announcement of the program for the 1991 crop of barley, the Secretary shall conduct a study to determine a fair and reasonable relationship between the feed values of barley and corn. The study shall take into account the relative feed value of the two feed grains when fed as is to the various livestock categories, on a dry-matter basis.	<u>SENATE AMENDMENT 2304</u> (ADOPTED 7/19/90) ADDED REQUIREMENT FOR BARLEY FEED VALUE DETERMINATION STUDY.
110) Impact of increasing minimum loan and purchase levels for program crops.	No such provision.	No such provision.	By October 1, 1991, the Secretary must conduct a study for each of the 1992-1995 crops of wheat, feed grains, upland cotton and rice which studies the impact of increasing the minimum loan rate to the corresponding target price for the crops or the projected average cost of production. The Secretary shall also study eliminating deficiency payments. The study should report the impact of each option as to export share, CCC outlays, and net farm income.	<u>SENATE AMENDMENT 2340</u> (ADOPTED 7/24/90) REQUIRES A STUDY OF THE IMPACTS OF INCREASING MINIMUM LOAN RATES.

COMPARISON OF PROPOSALS FOR THE 1990 FARM BILL--AS OF AUGUST 1, 1990

	Administration	House	Senate	Comments
111) Impact of durum wheat imports from Canada.	No addressed.	No such provision.	The Secretary shall conduct a study of the impact on domestic durum wheat growers of the importation of durum wheat from Canada. The study is due to Congress within one year of enactment of the bill.	<u>SENATE AMENDMENT 2370</u> (ADOPTED 7/25/90) PROVIDES FOR A STUDY OF THE IMPACT OF DURUM WHEAT IMPORTS FROM CANADA.
112) Impact of alfalfa seed imports from Canada.	Not addressed.	No such provision.	The Secretary shall conduct a study of the impact on domestic alfalfa seed growers of the importation of alfalfa seed from Canada. The study is due to Congress within one year of enactment of the bill.	<u>SENATE AMENDMENT 2371</u> (ADOPTED 7/25/90) PROVIDES FOR A STUDY OF THE IMPACT OF ALFALFA SEED IMPORTS FROM CANADA.
113) Impact of subsidized water on fluid milk production.	Not addressed.	No such provision.	The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine whether low-cost alfalfa, hay, pastureland and other forage irrigated with low-cost water from Federal reclamation projects is contributing to or promoting excess production of fluid milk. The study is due to Congress within one year of enactment of the bill.	<u>SENATE AMENDMENT 2391</u> (ADOPTED 7/26/90) REQUIRES A STUDY OF WHETHER LOW-COST FORAGE PRODUCED WITH SUBSIDIZED WATER CONTRIBUTES TO EXCESS FLUID MILK PRODUCTION.

COMPARISON OF PROPOSALS FOR THE 1990 FARM BILL--AS OF AUGUST 1, 1990

	Administration	House	Senate	Comments
114) Minority participation in ASCS programs.	Not addressed.	<p>The Secretary shall provide outreach and technical assistance through the Office of Advocacy and Enterprise to encourage and assist socially disadvantaged farmers to participate in programs authorized in this Act. Of the amounts appropriated to carry out this section, 50 percent shall be available only for grants and contracts to community based organizations with demonstrated experience and commitment in providing education, advocacy, or other services to minority farmers.</p> <p>The Director or the Office of Advocacy and Enterprise shall submit an annual report to Congress detailing on a State by State and county by county basis the rate of minority participation for each program under this Act.</p> <p>There are authorized to be appropriated \$10 million each fiscal year to carry out this section.</p>	<p>The Secretary shall review minority participation, compared to non-minority participation, in each crop program on a State-by-State and county-by-county basis. The review must identify reasons for participating or not participating in crop programs, including an analysis of different rates of minority and non-minority participation. The report is due to Congress not later than September 30, 1991.</p> <p>The Secretary shall calculate on a State-by-State and county-by-county basis the following information for each crop: total crop base for each crop, the percentage of total base controlled by minority producers, and the average payment yield of minority producers, compared to non-minority producers. Based on a review and public comment, the Secretary shall propose a plan to increase the rates of participation of minorities. No later than September 30, 1992, and every 2 years after, the Secretary shall report progress on the plan.</p>	<p><u>House</u> provision requires the Secretary to provide outreach and technical assistance to socially disadvantaged farmers.</p> <p><u>SENATE AMENDMENT 2390 (ADOPTED 7/26/90)</u> IS DESIGNED TO ENHANCE MINORITY PARTICIPATION IN USDA PROGRAMS COMMENSURATE WITH THAT OF NON-MINORITIES.</p>

COMPARISON OF PROPOSALS FOR THE 1990 FARM BILL--AS OF AUGUST 1, 1990

	Administration	House	Senate	Comments
115) Prioritize reporting requirements.	Not addressed.	No such provision.	To conserve scarce Federal resources, the Secretary may, after concurrence with the respective agriculture committees, rank by priority the studies and reports authorized by this Act and determine which of those studies shall be completed. The Secretary, however, must complete at least 12 studies or reports.	<u>SENATE AMENDMENT 2415</u> (ADOPTED 7/27/90) ALLOWS THE SECRETARY AND CONGRESS TO PRIORITIZE THE REPORTS REQUIRED BY THE ACT, AND TO DECIDE WHICH REPORTS MAY NOT BE COMPLETED.
116) Reporting and Recordkeeping Improvements Analysis	Not addressed.	No such provision.	Within 240 days of enactment, the Secretary shall complete an analysis that examines the feasibility of, and contains criteria and recommendations for, reducing and simplifying the recordkeeping and paperwork required of program participants. The analysis shall examine the feasibility of providing producers with access to USDA computer networks, and the feasibility of creating one brief application form to be used by applicants for USDA programs. The Secretary is authorized to use up to \$1,500,000 from CCC funds for such a study.	<u>SENATE AMENDMENT 2411</u> (ADOPTED 7/27/90) REQUIRES A FEASIBILITY ANALYSIS OF PAPERWORK REDUCTION OPTIONS.

PART II: CONSERVATION PROVISIONS

SUMMARY OF AMENDMENTS ADOPTED FOR THE 1990 FARM BILL PART II: CONSERVATION PROVISIONS

Date	SEN/HSE	Topic	Description	Item	Page
7/19/90	Senate	Multi-year set aside	Changes cost share from 50 to 25 percent.	181	93
7/19/90	Senate	Report	Requires report on an International CRP.	209	102
7/20/90	Senate	Noxious weeds	Requires implementation of a National management plan for weed control on Federal lands.	196	98
7/24/90	Senate	CRP Eligibility	Expands acres considered planted to include acreage not planted due to the Sec. action.	120	73
7/24/90	Senate	CRP Pest Control	Authorizes the renegotiation of CRP contracts in areas designated by the Sec. as most likely to incur pest infestation.	122, 195	74, 98
7/24/90	Senate	CRP Eligibility Preference	Gives preference for enrollment to areas with active State programs that have adopted quantitative pollution reduction goals.	121	74
7/25/90	Senate	Multiyear Program Contract Payments	Allows new owners of CRP land to receive payments if original contract is adhered to without regard to other CRP payments already being received.	127	76
7/27/90	Senate	Soil Conservation	Requires the Sec. to provide information concerning flexibility, base adjustment and conservation assistance to producers preparing or revising conservation plans.	177	92
			Institutes graduated penalties for conservation compliance and sodbuster. Technical and minor violations may be exempted from penalty.	173	91
			Requires comprehensive evaluations of all provisions of the Conservation Title, including monitoring the effectiveness of conservation compliance plans.	178	92

SUMMARY OF AMENDMENTS ADOPTED FOR THE 1990 FARM BILL

PART II: CONSERVATION PROVISIONS

Date	SEN/HSE	Topic	Description	Item	Page
7/27/90	Senate	Wetland Reserve Program	Buffer areas are eligible.	133	78
			Requires Sec. to give priority to permanent easements.	129	77
			Allows lump-sum payments for permanent easements.	136	78
			Allows Sec. to delegate management of easements to other Federal or State agencies.	138	79
7/27/90	Senate	CRP Enrollment Limits	Authorizes the Sec. to limit enrollment to 25 percent of the cropland on a farm if CRP enrollment exceeds 40 million acres.	119	72
8/1/90	House	Pesticide Recordkeeping	Requires any person using pesticides for to keep records.	186-190	94, 95
8/1/90	House	Farmland Preservation Program	Provides loan guarantees and interest rate subsidies for farmland preservation.	201	99
8/1/90	House	Agricultural Environmental Restoration	Requires Sec. to locate and identify facilities owned or operated by USDA where hazardous substances were released into the environment.	211	103
8/1/90	House	Resource-Conserving Crop	Requires Sec. to allow up to 25% of cropland on a farm, if it is HEL, to be devoted to conserving crop.	212	103
8/1/90	House	End Rows Set-Aside	Allows end rows to be eligible for ACR without regard to minimum width.	213	103
8/1/90	House	Conservation Priority Areas	Designates as conservation priority areas the Chesapeake Bay, Great Lakes, Long Island Sound and other areas of special environmental sensitivity.	121	74
8/1/90	House	Conservation Compliance Reduced Penalties	Institutes graduated penalties for conservation compliance for technical and good faith violations (\$375-\$2,500).	173	91

SUMMARY OF AMENDMENTS ADOPTED FOR THE 1990 FARM BILL

PART II: CONSERVATION PROVISIONS

Date	SEN/HSE	Topic	Description	Item	Page
8/1/90	House	Conservation Compliance Report	Requires comprehensive evaluation of Conservation Title, including monitoring the effectiveness of conservation plans.	178	92
8/1/90	House	Conservation Compliance Information Requirements	Requires Sec. to provide information concerning flexibility, base adjustment and conservation assistance to producers preparing or revising conservation plans.	177	92

COMPARISON OF PROPOSALS FOR THE 1990 FARM BILL--AS OF AUGUST 1, 1990

	Administration	Senate	House	Comments
	CONSERVATION RESERVE PROGRAM			
117) Name of program	Conservation Reserve Program.	Conservation Stewardship Program (CSP). Conservation Reserve Program renamed Environmental Conservation Acreage Reserve Program (ECARP). [1211,1225]	Conservation Reserve Program. [1603]	Senate: CSP includes ECARP, Wetland Reserve, and the Water Quality Incentives Program. [1211]
118) Acreage enrollment goal	40 million acres (6 million additional acres, including wetland reserve acreage).	Sec. shall enroll 40 to 50 million acres in CSP. (At least 6 million new acres, including wetland reserve acreage.) [1211] Up to 1 million acres during 1991-1994 may be considered enrolled based on ratio of ECARP costs to Water Quality Incentive Program costs. [1211]	Up to 45-million acres (not including wetland). No minimum enrollment specified. [1603] Not less than one-eighth devoted to trees, shrubs, hydrophytic vegetation, critical area seedings, or other non-crop vegetation or water that provides permanent wildlife habitat. [1603]	Senate: Sec. shall consider prices, stocks, exports, natural disasters in deciding whether to go beyond 40 million acres. [1211] Both versions extend enrollment period to 1995. [1211,1603] Contracts in both would generally be for 10 years, 15 years for hardwoods, windbreaks, shelterbelts.

COMPARISON OF PROPOSALS FOR THE 1990 FARM BILL--AS OF AUGUST 1, 1990

	Administration	Senate	House	Comments
119) Acreage enrollment limitation	Waive 25-percent county cropland limit where water quality benefits outweigh adverse economic impacts.	25-percent county cropland limit waived if local economy not adversely affected or county producers are having severe difficulty meeting conservation and environmental requirements, or water quality risk outweighs local economic impacts. [1211] Limit does not apply to windbreaks or shelterbelts. [1211]	No more than 25 percent in CRP or easements, unless economy not adversely affected and producers having difficulty complying with conservation plans. [1603] Limits pasture planted to trees to 10 percent of new enrollment. [1603]	Senate: Sec. shall not require written consent of a member of Congress to waive limitation. [1212] Senate: SEC. MAY LIMIT ENROLLMENT TO 25 PERCENT OF THE CROPLAND ON A FARM IF CRP ENROLLMENT EXCEEDS 40 MILLION ACRES. [1211] House: Wording to limit enrollment per county is confusing.

COMPARISON OF PROPOSALS FOR THE 1990 FARM BILL--AS OF AUGUST 1, 1990

	Administration	Senate	House	Comments
120) Eligibility criteria	<p>Allows windbreaks without whole fields.</p> <p>Retargets to focus on water quality, wildlife habitat, and forestation.</p> <p>Eligible lands could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Cropland in wellhead protection and sinkhole areas. - Cropland in impaired watersheds (Sec. 319 areas). - Cropland where nonpoint sources pose significant threat to endangered species habitat. - Filterstrips. - Other lands where water quality could be enhanced by cropland retirement. 	<p>Sec. shall include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Windbreaks, shelterbelts, contour strips that reduce soil loss on highly erodible cropland or that reduce on-farm or off-farm environmental threat. [1213] - Environmentally sensitive, economically marginal pastureland devoted to trees. [1213] - Other lands that could pose on-farm or off-farm threat to water quality, including cropland in State approved wellhead protection areas, sinkhole areas, State approved critical cropland (Sec. 319) areas, filterstrips, and areas where nonpoint sources threaten endangered species. [1213] <p>Easements for useful lives required for windbreaks or shelterbelts. [1215]</p>	<p>Sec. may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Highly erodible cropland if continued cropping could substantially reduce productive capacity or cannot be farmed in accordance with a conservation or water quality plan. [1603] - Marginal pastureland converted to wetland, planted to wildlife habitat, or planted to trees in or near to riparian areas. [1603] - Cropland that contributes to degradation of water quality or that could pose other off-farm or on-farm (salinity) environmental threat. [1603] - Cropland planted to trees, wildlife habitat, windbreaks, living snow fences, shelterbelts, grass waterways, contour strips, filterstrips. [1603] - Farmed wetlands, if wildlife values and functions restored. [1603] 	<p>Senate: Land not eligible if Water Quality Incentive Program can achieve goals. [1213]</p> <p>Senate: Sec. may limit the amount of pastureland enrolled per farm. [1213]</p> <p>Senate: EXPANDS ACRES CONSIDERED PLANTED TO INCLUDE ACREAGE NOT PLANTED DUE TO SEC. ACTION. [1286]</p> <p>House: Any cropland planted to trees would be eligible. [1603]</p> <p>House: Allows cropland on which the Sec. has prevented production of agricultural commodities. [1603]</p> <p>Both: Marginal pastureland and environmentally sensitive, economically marginal pastureland undefined.</p> <p>Admin. and Senate proposals would add to eligibility language in current law; House proposal would replace current law.</p>

COMPARISON OF PROPOSALS FOR THE 1990 FARM BILL--AS OF AUGUST 1, 1990

	Administration	Senate	House	Comments
121) Priority, acceptability of contracts		<p>Priority to offers that provide for the greatest public benefit. [1218]</p> <p>May consider benefits to wildlife. [1218]</p> <p>GIVES PREFERENCE FOR ENROLLMENT TO AREAS WITH ACTIVE STATE PROGRAMS THAT HAVE ADOPTED QUANTITATIVE POLLUTION REDUCTION GOALS. [1218]</p>	<p>May consider soil resource improvement, water quality enhancement, or other environmental benefits. [1603]</p> <p>Where appropriate, accept shelterbelts, windbreaks, living snow fences, filterstrips, and trees that will enhance water quality. [1603]</p>	<p>House: DESIGNATES PRIORITY AREAS, REQUIRING ENROLLMENT OF AT LEAST 50 PERCENT OF THE NATIONAL RATE OF ENROLLED TO ELIGIBLE ACRES; AND ALLOWS ONE-TIME CASH BONUS, 5-15 YR. CONTRACTS, AND OTHER INCENTIVES AS DETERMINED BY THE SEC. [1603]</p> <p>House: May establish different criteria for different areas. [1603]</p>
122) Conversion and extension of current contracts		<p>Sec. shall allow conversion of prior converted wetland to wetland if permanent or long-term easement provided. [1215]</p>		<p>Senate: AUTHORIZES THE RENEGOTIATION OF CRP CONTRACTS IN AREAS DESIGNATED BY THE SEC. AS MOST LIKELY TO INCUR PEST INFESTATION. [1237]</p> <p>Both: Other proposals listed in Tree Planting Incentives section (# 125).</p>
123) Protection of land after contract expiration	<p>Extend base protection if conservation cover maintained.</p> <p>New contracts require "T".</p>	<p>Extend base protection if conservation cover maintained. [1221]</p> <p>New contracts require "T" if feasible. [1220]</p>	<p>Extend base protection up to 10 years if conservation cover maintained, allow limited haying and grazing; prohibits any cost share, annual rental, or bonus payments. [1603]</p>	<p>House: Includes provision requiring 50-percent reduction in erosion level for new or revised conservation plans, if feasible. [1601]</p>
124) Planting restriction on highly erodible sod		<p>Producers with new contracts in counties that have not reached 25-percent limit, may not produce agricultural commodities on other highly erodible land that does not have a history of crop production. [1212]</p>		<p>Senate: Violators ineligible for commodity program payments, storage loans, crop insurance, disaster payments, FmHA loans, storage payments. [1212]</p> <p>Senate: Benefits denied even if erosion controlled. [1212]</p>

COMPARISON OF PROPOSALS FOR THE 1990 FARM BILL--AS OF AUGUST 1, 1990

	Administration	Senate	House	Comments
125) Tree planting incentives	<p>Allow windbreaks, shelterbelts without whole fields.</p> <p>Other incentives provided under President's tree planting initiative, America the Beautiful.</p>	<p>Sec. shall allow new contracts devoted to hardwoods, windbreaks, shelterbelts to be up to 15 years. [1216]</p> <p>Current contracts devoted to hardwoods, windbreaks, or shelterbelts may be extended to 15 years. [1216]</p> <p>Sec. shall allow producers to convert grass cover to hardwoods, windbreaks, shelterbelts, and to extend contracts to 15 years (50-percent cost share shall be provided, if appropriate). [1215]</p> <p>Continuous signup for hardwoods. [1216]</p> <p>50 to 75 percent cost share if land devoted to hardwoods, windbreaks, shelterbelts. [1216]</p> <p>May permit tree planting to occur over 3 years. [1216]</p> <p>May allow alley cropping if planted to hardwoods, bid system used to reduce annual payments by at least 50 percent, and no net cost. [1220]</p>	<p>Same as Senate. [1604]</p> <p>Same as Senate. [1603]</p> <p>Sec. shall allow producers to convert grass to indigenous trees, with total cost sharing (including original amount for grass cover) not to exceed total cost of establishing indigenous trees; and to extend contracts to 15 years. [1604]</p> <p>Same as Senate. [1604]</p> <p>Same as Senate. [1604]</p> <p>May allow agroforestry (alley cropping in Senate version), with 5-year contract extension. [1603]</p>	<p>Senate: Producers must provide easements for the useful lives of windbreaks, shelterbelts (new, extended, or converted contracts). [1213,1215]</p> <p>House: Shall permit modification of current contracts to permit sustained-yield harvesting during last 3 years if base permanently retired (additional compensation shall be provided for base retired). [1604]</p> <p>House: In determining whether to cost share 50 or 75 percent, Sec. is to consider the one-eighth tree planting requirement. [1604]</p> <p>House: Cost-share recipients may not receive cost sharing from other Federal program. [1604]</p> <p>20-year contracts allowed (at Sec. discretion) in House's agroforestry provision?</p> <p>Cost sharing not provided in agroforestry/agronomic cropping options?</p> <p>Alley cropping involves the production of agricultural commodities between rows of trees for a period of years until the trees become too large.</p> <p>See also #'s 1 and 2 in Forest Service side-by-side.</p>

COMPARISON OF PROPOSALS FOR THE 1990 FARM BILL--AS OF AUGUST 1, 1990

	Administration	Senate	House	Comments
126) Easement provisions	To extent possible, encourage easements.	May enter into easement agreements of 30 or more years, and shall encourage permanent easements. [1214] Easement payments shall not exceed fair market value. [1214]	Easements provided for under easement program in Wetland and Environmental Protection Program. [1608]	
127) Other		3-year ownership requirement waived if family farmer buys land from lending institution. [1219] Discretionary "bid-back" program to remove least highly erodible land, at no net cost, and no decrease in erosion reduction. [1217] USDA required to study expiring contracts, make recommendations. [1222] Penalty for failure to control noxious weeds increased. Penalty to be based on the entire acreage producer has enrolled in the program. [1237]	Exempts from sequester. [1603] For applicable reduction in payemnts, Sec. may permit fall and winter grazing on land that is incidental to gleaning of crops. [1603] Adds water cover for wildlife as approved cover. [1603] Cost share from all sources may not exceed 100 percent of cost. [1603] Allows CRP payments to continue to be made to heirs, even if CRP payment cap has been reached. [1101]	Senate: Sec. may extend contracts or purchase easements if the study indicates desirability. [1222] House: Annual rental payments shall be based on comparable local rental rates, and shall not exceed prevailing local rental rate for comparable land. [1603] Senate: ALLOWS CRP PAYMENTS TO CONTINUE TO BE MADE TO HEIRS, EVEN IF CRP PAYMENT CAP HAS BEEN REACHED. [1011]

COMPARISON OF PROPOSALS FOR THE 1990 FARM BILL--AS OF AUGUST 1, 1990

	Administration	Senate	House	Comments
	WETLAND RESERVE PROGRAM			
128) Name of program	Wetland Reserve.	Wetland Reserve Program. (Second Component of the CSP.) [1223]	National Agricultural Wetland Reserve, part of Wetland and Environmental Easement Program. [1608]	
129) Enrollment goal, easement terms	At least 10 percent of new reserve lands (0.6 million acres) under permanent easement as part of CRP.	A minimum of 1 million acres under permanent or long term easements (as part of CSP's 40-50 million acre goal). 30 year minimum easement. [1223]	Shall seek to enroll up to 2.5 million acres under perpetual easements (in program separate from CRP), during 1991-1995 fiscal years. [1608]	House: Easements are perpetual or for the maximum term allowed under State law. [1608] Senate: REQUIRES SEC. TO GIVE PRIORITY TO PERMANENT EASEMENTS. [1223]
130) Restoration plan		Developed by SCS in concurrence with FWS. [1223]	Developed by SCS in consultation with FWS. [1608]	
131) Enrollment limits		No more that 25 percent of county cropland in CSP, ECARP, WRP, with same exemptions as CSP (see # 119). [1223]	Up to 10 percent of a county's cropland. No more than 25 percent in CRP or under easements, unless local economy not adversely affected and producers having difficulty complying with conservation plans. [1608]	

COMPARISON OF PROPOSALS FOR THE 1990 FARM BILL--AS OF AUGUST 1, 1990

	Administration	Senate	House	Comments
132) Economic use	Provides for economic use.	Crop production, timber harvesting, haying, grazing and other uses allowed if specified in plan. [1223]	Agricultural commodity production only for wildlife benefit. [1608] "Customary" forestry practices cannot be prohibited in areas landowner specifies for timber harvest; other commercial use allowed if specified in plan. [1608]	
133) Eligible lands	Existing cropped wetlands, restorable wetlands.	Existing cropped wetlands, restorable wetlands, other non-cropped wetlands on farm, if functional value enhanced. [1223] SCS CONSULTS WITH LOCAL REPRESENTATIVES OF FWS. [1223] BUFFER AREAS ARE ELIGIBLE. [1223]	Current CRP, farmed wetlands, restorable wetlands, adjacent cropland, Water Bank land, riparian corridors and critical wildlife habitat, and other environmentally sensitive areas where continued crop production would prevent compliance with environmental goals. [1608]	House: Current CRP not eligible if likely to remain out of production, or if no off-farm environmental threat; CRP timber stands or CRP pasture planted to trees not eligible. [1608] House: Land which has changed ownership in past year, if purchased for enrollment, not eligible. [1608] Under both versions, only wetland converted prior to Dec. 23, 1985 would be eligible. [1223,1608]
134) Acceptability of contracts, priority		Consider wetland value, likelihood of restoration success, cost of restoration. [1223]	In consultation with FWS, base priority on value for protecting wetlands and enhancing wildlife habitat. [1608]	House: May consider extent that wetland value would be restored, productivity of land, environmental threat if production continues. [1608]
135) Payment amounts	Amount not to exceed property value.	Not to exceed fair market value. [1223] Amount may be determined by bid. [1223]	Payments may not exceed the value of the land without an easement, and may not exceed \$250,000 total or \$50,000 a year. [1608]	House: May consider the amount necessary to encourage producers to participate. [1608]
136) Payment terms	10 annual payments or one up front payment.	Annual payments over 5 to 20 years, equal or unequal size. [1223]	Annual payments over 1 to 10 years. [1608]	Senate: ALLOWS LUMP-SUM PAYMENTS FOR PERMANENT EASEMENTS. [1223]

COMPARISON OF PROPOSALS FOR THE 1990 FARM BILL--AS OF AUGUST 1, 1990

	Administration	Senate	House	Comments
137) Cost share for restoration, etc.		50 to 75 percent if 30-year easement, no more than 100 percent if permanent easement. [1223]	Up to 100 percent cost share. [1608]	
138) Other		SEC. MAY DELEGATE MANAGEMENT OF EASEMENTS TO OTHER FEDERAL OR STATE AGENCIES. [1223]	Base permanently retired. [1608] Exempt from sequester. [1608]	Both: Versions require agreement to be recorded on deed.

COMPARISON OF PROPOSALS FOR THE 1990 FARM BILL--AS OF AUGUST 1, 1990

	Administration	Senate	House	Comments
	WATER QUALITY PROGRAM			
139) Name of program	Water Quality Initiative, consisting of hydrologic unit, regional, and demonstration projects.	Agricultural Water Quality Incentives Program. (Third part of the CSP.) [1224]	Agricultural Water Quality Protection Program. [1607]	
140) Enrollment goal	No acreage goals.	Must enroll sufficient land to achieve water quality improvement. [1224]	At least 20 million acres, during 1991-1995 crop years. [1607]	USDA projects 10 million acre enrollment under Senate proposal. Both versions: Farmers would voluntarily implement water quality plans in return for incentive payments, etc.
141) Incentive to participate	Cost share, technical assistance, information.	Incentive payments, technical assistance, information. [1224]	Incentive payments, cost share, technical assistance, information, education, training. [1607] Base and payment yield protected during agreement period. [1607]	House: Offers a wetland or wildlife habitat option (with 50-percent cost share) if producer has water quality plan. [1607]
142) Eligible lands	Problem areas identified at regional and State level.	Lands where agricultural production could contribute to potential degradation of water quality, including public wellhead, sinkhole, and critical cropland areas identified in State Sec. 319 plans. [1224]	Impaired watersheds identified in State Sec. 319 plans, wellhead protection areas identified under Safe Water Act, other areas recommended by States, and, other areas as recommended by EPA, DOI, in consultation with USDA. [1607]	Senate: Lands where threatened or endangered species habitat is significantly threatened by agricultural nonpoint sources. [1224]

COMPARISON OF PROPOSALS FOR THE 1990 FARM BILL--AS OF AUGUST 1, 1990

	Administration	Senate	House	Comments
143) Payment and contract terms	Agricultural Conservation Program agreements.	<p>Incentive payments, on per-acre basis, made over 3 to 5 year period, or in lump sum. [1224]</p> <p>Contracts not less than 5 years. [1224]</p> <p>Payments shall consider amount necessary to encourage participation, cost and effort involved in implementing plans. [1224]</p>	<p>Incentive payments, on per-acre basis, made over 1 to 5 year period. [1607]</p> <p>Agreements of up to 5 years. [1607]</p> <p>Payments shall consider amount necessary to encourage participation, additional costs incurred by producers, and production values foregone. [1607]</p>	Both: Versions prohibit making payments if payments from other Federal program is made for the same practice.
144) Payment limits	Cost share payments limited to \$3,500 per year.	Incentive payments limited to \$3,500 per year. [1224]	Same as Senate, plus up to \$1,500 additional in cost-share assistance for wetland or wildlife habitat option. [1607]	
145) Selection of contracts, agreements priority		<p>Sec. shall consider degree of reduction in contamination potential, and give priority to areas identified by States in consultation with EPA. [1224]</p> <p>Sec. shall give priority to offers that provide for greatest benefits. [1224]</p>	<p>Priority to lands where agricultural production contributes or creates the potential for failure to meet applicable water quality standards or goals. [1607]</p>	<p>Senate: Requires emphasis on practices that enhance farm profitability and productivity through reducing waste and inefficiency. [1224]</p> <p>House: Indicates that plans should include specific practices that ensure continued farm productivity and profitability by promoting efficient use of inputs, and should include practices for safe storage, mixing, and loading of inputs, and handling of animal wastes. [1607]</p>

COMPARISON OF PROPOSALS FOR THE 1990 FARM BILL--AS OF AUGUST 1, 1990

	Administration	Senate	House	Comments
146) Model farm, demonstration, pilot projects	As contained in Water Quality Initiative, priority where there is high potential for contamination of groundwater, and where degradation could have immediate adverse impacts on people.	To extent practicable, encourage participation in demonstration and model farm projects sponsored by governmental or private non-profit entities. [1224] May establish pilot projects. [1224]		
147) Evaluations	USDA monitors and evaluates projects.	USDA collects and maintains national database. [1224]	USDA provides interim and final report to Congress on efforts. [1607]	
148) Other			Consults with EPA, DOI, and relevant State agencies in developing field office technical guides. [1607]	House: Producers shall be notified that plans are available to the public, upon request. [1607]

COMPARISON OF PROPOSALS FOR THE 1990 FARM BILL--AS OF AUGUST 1, 1990

	Administration	Senate	House	Comments
149) Other water quality programs			<p>Experimental Water Quality Enhancement Program (included in Research Title) provides for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reduction in set-aside requirements. - Increase in permitted acres. - Increased payment yields. - Loans to implement practices, test wells. - No incentive payments. <p>Participants encouraged to obtain cost-share assistance.</p> <p>[Sec. 1372]</p>	<p>Both: Contain integrated crop/farm management programs that encourage reduced chemical use, and involve plans that must indicate methods by which water quality would be enhanced.</p> <p>See #'s 150-164.</p>

COMPARISON OF PROPOSALS FOR THE 1990 FARM BILL--AS OF AUGUST 1, 1990

	Administration	Senate	House	Comments
	INTEGRATED FARM/CROP MANAGEMENT PROGRAM			
150) Definition of resource-conserving crops		Legumes, and legume-grass, legume-small grain, and legume-grass-small grain mixtures. [1284]	Same plus alternative crops which are experimental and industrial crops grown in arid and semi-arid regions that conserve soil and water. [1611]	
151) Definition of resource-conserving crop rotation		Includes a resource-conserving crop, reduces erosion, and improves input efficiency. [1284]	Includes a resource-conserving crop, reduces erosion, aids soil fertility, interrupts pest cycles, and conserves water. [1611]	
152) Definition of farming operations and practices			Includes rotation practice, tillage systems, livestock production systems, health and safety considerations, etc. [1611]	
153) Program establishment		Shall be established by the Sec. (participation voluntary). [1284]	Same as Senate. [1611]	Both: Annual progress report to Congress.
154) Eligibility		Producers must submit plan and comply with terms. [1284]	Same plus producer must keep records as required. [1611]	
155) Contract term		5-year contract. [1284]	At least 3 years, but may be up to 10 years at producer's option. [1611]	

COMPARISON OF PROPOSALS FOR THE 1990 FARM BILL--AS OF AUGUST 1, 1990

	Administration	Senate	House	Comments
156) Plan		Describes operations and practices to be implemented, and how they could be expected to result in reductions in purchased inputs, agricultural pollution, etc. [1284]	Describes operations and practices to be implemented, and how they could be expected to enhance productivity and profitability, and protect water supplies. [1611]	Both: Sec. shall provide technical assistance, allow modifications to plans. Plans must indicate how water quality would be enhanced.
157) Enrollment goal and limit		To extent practicable, 3-5 million cropland acres annually during 1991-1995. [1284]	To extent practicable, Sec. shall not enroll acreage if cropland removed from production plus CRP and 0/92 and 50/92 would exceed 25 percent of county cropland. [1611] Any enrollment in the program that results in an average decrease of harvested acres on a farm of greater than 25 percent over the life of the plan shall be applied toward the CRP county limit. [1611]	No enrollment goal in House version.
158) Economic effects		Sec. may limit amount of hay that can be harvested or grazed if the program will have a significant impact on hay or livestock prices in a particular area. [1284]	Program implementation to minimize adverse economic effect on agriculturally related interests. [1611] May restrict amount of acreage removed from production. [1611]	
159) Tenants and lessees			Plans that result in involuntary displacement of tenants or lessees shall not be approved. [1611]	

COMPARISON OF PROPOSALS FOR THE 1990 FARM BILL--AS OF AUGUST 1, 1990

	Administration	Senate	House	Comments
160) Base and payment protection	<p>Protect crop base of producers who plant legumes, grasses, or conserving crops as part of a sustainable agricultural rotation.</p> <p>Deficiency payments for base acres planted to soil-building crop if not harvested.</p> <p>Allow planting of any combination of program crops and oilseeds on permitted acres and receive deficiency payments on pre-1990 Farm Bill cropping history.</p>	<p>Crop acreage bases and farm program payments shall not be reduced due to planting a resource-conserving crop as part of a resource-conserving rotation. [1284]</p> <p>No payments on acreage that is hayed or grazed. [1284]</p> <p>Payments not affected if a resource-conserving small grain crop is harvested in kernel form and the residue is grazed after the 5-month period during which haying and grazing of conserving use acreage are not permitted. [1284]</p>	<p>Crop acreage bases, farm program payment yields, or farm program payments shall not be reduced due to planting a resource-conserving crop as part of a resource-conserving rotation. [1611]</p> <p>No payments if the acreage is hayed or grazed during the 5-month period during which haying and grazing are not allowed on conserving use acreage, or before the producer harvests a small grain crop in kernel form, whichever is sooner. [1611]</p> <p>Producers may plant base acres to another program crop and maintain base acreage, but will not be eligible for payments unless the planted crop is part of a resource-conserving crop. [1611]</p>	Detailed description of Senate, House, and Administration flexibility proposals are contained in Part I of this document.
161) Cross-compliance exemption		Requirements of other acreage reduction programs shall be waived if necessary for the plan. [1284]		

COMPARISON OF PROPOSALS FOR THE 1990 FARM BILL--AS OF AUGUST 1, 1990

	Administration	Senate	House	Comments
162) Existing crop rotation practices			Adjustments shall be made to crop payment base to reflect resource-conserving crop rotation practices that were maintained prior to the program. [1611]	
163) Adjustments in production adjustment requirements		<p>Adjustments in acreage reduction requirements shall be made to take into account crop rotation, conservation practices, and other appropriate factors. [1284]</p> <p>Acreage reduction requirement shall be waived or reduced if the reduction in program crop production and total crop production will equal or exceed the reduction that would occur due to acreage reduction requirements in the absence of this program. [1284]</p>	<p>Adjustments to acreage limitation or set-aside requirements shall be made to take into account crop rotation, conservation practices, and other appropriate factors. [1611]</p> <p>Requirements shall be waived or reduced if the reduction in program crop production and total crop production will equal or exceed the reduction that would occur due to acreage limitation or set-aside requirements in the absence of the program. [1611]</p>	

COMPARISON OF PROPOSALS FOR THE 1990 FARM BILL--AS OF AUGUST 1, 1990

	Administration	Senate	House	Comments
164) Payment acreage limitation			<p>Payments under wheat, feed grains, rice or cotton programs shall not be received on traditionally under-planted acreage (defined as the 3-year average, prior to enactment, of the crop base not planted to the program crop minus the crop base required to be idled.) [1611]</p> <p>For participants under the 0/92 and 50/92 provisions, traditionally under-planted acreage is 8 percent of their permitted planting acreage. [1611]</p>	

COMPARISON OF PROPOSALS FOR THE 1990 FARM BILL--AS OF AUGUST 1, 1990

	Current Law	Senate	House	Comments
	SWAMPBUSTER PROVISIONS			
165) Actions that result in sanctions	Production of an agricultural commodity on a converted wetland.	Production of an agricultural commodity on a converted wetland or conversion of a wetland for, or to make possible, production of an agricultural commodity. [1286]	Same as Senate. [1602]	Both: Would not deny benefits to non-converting producers who grow non-agricultural commodities on converted wetland.
166) Exemption for minimal effect, mitigation	Exemption may be granted, in consultation with FWS, if actions have minimal effect on hydrological and biological value. Mitigation is not specified in current law.	Exemption may be granted if actions have minimal effect on functional hydrological and biological value; or if land has been frequently cropped and action is mitigated through restoration of prior converted wetland. [1286]	Same as Senate, except that agreements on restored wetlands not on property of the producer must be recorded on deed, and unpaid easements must be provided on wetlands used for mitigation. [1602]	Both: Wetlands converted after Dec. 23, 1985 may not be used for mitigation. Both: Use of wetlands in easement program may not be used for mitigation purposes. Both: Require mitigated wetlands to be in general area of watershed, to be on 1-for-1 acreage basis unless more acreage is needed.
167) Determination of minimal effect, mitigation exemption; acceptability of restoration plans	SCS consults with FWS.	Local SCS and FWS concur. If no agreement, State SCS consults with State FWS and decides. [1286] State SCS and FWS must report all local disagreements to respective Washington offices. [1286]	Same as Senate, except USDA shall establish guidelines for mitigation and restoration plans in consultation with FWS. [1602]	House: Allows producers to appeal mitigation requirements above a 1-1 ratio. [1602]
168) Created wetland exemption			Exempts converters of artificial lakes, ponds, created wetlands, etc. [1602]	

COMPARISON OF PROPOSALS FOR THE 1990 FARM BILL--AS OF AUGUST 1, 1990

	Current Law	Senate	House	Comments
169) Additional requirements			<p>Wetland maps must be certified, reviewed, made public, and updated periodically. [1602]</p> <p>Field inspections required prior to decisions on delineation appeals. [1602]</p> <p>No person shall be adversely affected if review changes determination, or unrelated entity causes land to be redefined as wetland. [1602]</p>	<p>House: Annual report to Congress on appeals, identifying those pending over 120 days. [1609]</p> <p>House: Requires public list to be maintained of all wetland determinations. [1602]</p> <p>Both: Require that success of restoration efforts be monitored.</p>
170) Penalty for violation	All benefits denied.	May violate without full penalty once in 10 years , if wetland restored, and conversion occurred in good faith. [1286]	Same as Senate, except that on-site inspections required prior to withholding any benefits. [1602]	Both: "Fine" of \$750 to \$10,000, depending on seriousness of violation.
171) Program ineligibility	Violators ineligible for commodity program payments, farm storage facility loans, crop insurance, disaster payments, certain loans, and storage payments.		Adds Disaster Assistance Act of 1989, ACP, ECP, CRP, Wetland and Environmental Easement Program, Natural Resources Loan Program, Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, to list. [1602]	
172) Duration of program ineligibility	Ineligible only in years that converted wetland is planted.	Ineligible until converted wetland is restored or mitigated. [1286]	Same as Senate. [1602]	

COMPARISON OF PROPOSALS FOR THE 1990 FARM BILL--AS OF AUGUST 1, 1990

	Administration	Senate	House	Comments
	CONSERVATION COMPLIANCE PROVISIONS			
173) Graduated, reduced penalty		MAY VIOLATE WITHOUT FULL PENALTY ONCE IN 10 YEARS, IF MINOR AND IN GOOD FAITH AND PLAN THEN FOLLOWED, "FINE" OF \$750 TO \$10,000. [1235] TECHNICAL AND MINOR VIOLATIONS HAVING MINIMAL EFFECT MAY BE EXEMPTED FROM PENALTY. [1235]	MAY VIOLATE WITHOUT FULL PENALTY ONCE IN FIVE YEARS, IF MINOR AND IN GOOD FAITH AND PLAN THEN FOLLOWED, "FINE" OF \$375 TO \$2,500. [1601]	HOUSE: ANNUALLY REPORT TO CONGRESS ON SUCH DETERMINATIONS. [1601]
174) ACR and CU	Explicitly include HEL idled under annual commodity programs.	Same as Administration. [1231]	Same as Administration. [1601]	
175) Conservation plans on expired CRP lands		Producers have 2 years to implement plans after CRP contract expires if structures required. [1220] Erosion on lands under new contracts would be required to be reduced to "T", if feasible. [1220]	Producers have 2 years to implement plans after CRP contract expires, or longer if needed to install required structures. [1603]	House: If current plan does not cover CRP lands after contract expiration, erosion would have to be reduced 50 percent, if feasible on CRP lands coming out of contract. [1601]
176) Tenant ineligibility exemption		Penalty limited to other non-complying farms if landlord refuses to comply, tenant made good faith effort, and not scheme or device. [1232]	Same as Senate, except that landlord or other tenant may have refused to comply. [1601]	Both: Require annual report to Congress on exemptions granted.

COMPARISON OF PROPOSALS FOR THE 1990 FARM BILL--AS OF AUGUST 1, 1990

	Administration	Senate	House	Comments
177) New, revised plans, reviewing plans		<p>All cost effective conservation measures must be made known to producers obtaining or revising plans. [1233]</p> <p>SEC. MUST PROVIDE INFORMATION CONCERNING FLEXIBILITY, BASE ADJUSTMENT AND CONSERVATION ASSISTANCE TO PRODUCERS PREPARING OR REVISING CONSERVATION PLANS. [1233]</p>	<p>New or revised plans must achieve 50-percent reduction in erosion, if feasible. [1601]</p> <p>When reviewing conservation compliance plans, SCS required to determine conflicts which would arise if water management practices were incorporated. [1612]</p> <p>SEC. MUST PROVIDE INFORMATION CONCERNING FLEXIBILITY, BASE ADJUSTMENT AND CONSERVATION ASSISTANCE TO PRODUCERS PREPARING OR REVISING CONSERVATION PLANS. [1603]</p>	House: Report language stipulates that revised plans may not impose more stringent requirements than those which existed on Jan. 1, 1990.
178) Reports		REQUIRES COMPREHENSIVE EVALUATION OF ALL CONSERVATION TITLE PROVISIONS, INCLUDING MONITORING EFFECTIVENESS OF CONSERVATION COMPLIANCE PLANS. [1238]	SAME AS SENATE. [1609]	House: Annual report to Congress on appeals, showing those pending over 120 days. [1609]
179) Programs, benefits forfeited			Adds to list, same programs as in swampbuster section. [1601]	Senate: No penalty if non-commercial use of 2 acres or less. [1234]

COMPARISON OF PROPOSALS FOR THE 1990 FARM BILL--AS OF AUGUST 1, 1990

	Administration	Senate	House	Comments
	MULTI-YEAR SET ASIDE			
180) Cover on set-aside land	Must plant annual or perennial on 50 percent of land removed from production under annual commodity programs, not to exceed 5 percent of base acreage for the crop.	Same as Administration. [301, ...]	Makes MYSA in 1985 Farm Bill mandatory, but leaves it a voluntary program for producers. [1107] Cost share if producer plants 50 percent of set aside to perennial or annual crop. [1106]	Senate: Also extends MYSA in 1985 Act. [1018] House: Producers exempt from planting requirements if they have conservation plan. [1106] See also # 17.
181) Cost share	50 percent of approved cost for perennials; payment on up to 50 percent of set aside, not to exceed 5-percent of crop's base acreage.	Same as Administration, except that producer must agree to maintain cost shared perennial cover for 3 years. [301,...]	Cost share provided whenever multi-year contract entered. [1106]	Senate: SEC. TO PAY 25 PERCENT OF APPROVED COST OF PERENNIALS. [301,...] See also # 17.
	NATURAL RESOURCES LOAN PROGRAM			
182) Purpose			To encourage alleviation of natural resource problems. [1605]	Mandatory program. Loans for conservation structures and other purposes also available under another proposed program (see # 192, Soil and Water Loans).

COMPARISON OF PROPOSALS FOR THE 1990 FARM BILL--AS OF AUGUST 1, 1990

	Administration	Senate	House	Comments
183) Eligibility			Determined by State and County Committees in consultation with SCS, Conservation District, FWS; or for implementing water quality protection plans. [1605]	
184) Terms			May not exceed 10 years. [1605]	Interest rate based on rate charged CCC by U.S. Treasury on date loans made.
185) Payment limitations			Amount limited to \$100 million per year. [1605] Amount per producer limited to \$50,000. [1605] Loans larger than \$25,000 must be secured. [1605]	
RECORD KEEPING FOR PESTICIDES				
186) Required records		In consultation with EPA, Sec. must ensure that certified applicators maintain records of restricted use pesticides. [1283]	REQUIRES ANY PERSON USING PESTICIDES FOR AG PRODUCTION TO MAINTAIN RECORDS OF PESTICIDE USE. [1371A]	Senate: Sec. must notify EPA if records not maintained for 2 years. [1283]
187) Penalty		Loss of certification. [1283]	FINE OF \$500 TO \$1000. [1371A]	

COMPARISON OF PROPOSALS FOR THE 1990 FARM BILL--AS OF AUGUST 1, 1990

	Administration	Senate	House	Comments
188) Access to records		<p>Available to any Federal or State agency that deals with pesticide, health, environmental issues. [1283]</p> <p>Records shall not be disclosed except to employees of the agencies. [1283]</p>	<p>SAME AS SENATE. [1371A]</p> <p>SAME AS SENATE. [1371A]</p>	<p>Both: Producers shall make records available to medical personnel to provide emergency medical treatment.</p> <p>HOUSE: NAME AND ADDRESS OF PRODUCER TO REMAIN CONFIDENTIAL. [1371A]</p>
189) Records to be kept		<p>Four items: pesticide used, amount used, where applied, and when applied. [1283]</p>	<p>NINE ITEMS: PRODUCT NAME, AMOUNT APPLIED, RATE OF APPLICATION, METHOD OF APPLICATION, TARGET PEST, CROP OR SITE TREATED, DATE APPLIED, TIME APPLIED, AND WHERE APPLIED. [1371A]</p>	
190) Database		<p>Sec., in consultation with EPA, shall develop and maintain database on pesticide use, and provide periodic reports. [1283]</p>	<p>SIMILAR TO SENATE. [1371A]</p>	

COMPARISON OF PROPOSALS FOR THE 1990 FARM BILL--AS OF AUGUST 1, 1990

	Administration	Senate	House	Comments
	MISCELLANEOUS CONSERVATION PROVISIONS			
191) Cost Share for Soil Enhancement			<p>Amends Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act (ACP) to include measures that enhance soil fertility and physical characteristics of soil. [1613]</p> <p>Authorizes 50-percent cost share for establishing short term (1 or 2 years) stands of legumes and legume-grass mixtures in resource-conserving crop rotation. [1613]</p>	<p>Farm program payments may not be made on these lands.</p> <p>Land does not have to be eroding above "T".</p>
192) Soil and Water Loans		<p>Broadens eligibility for soil and water conservation loans. [1303]</p> <p>Loans may be used for installation of conservation structures, forest cover, or permanent pasture, or conversion to or maintenance of sustainable agricultural systems. [1303]</p>	<p>Similar to Senate. [1605]</p> <p>Priority for installation of conservation structures needed for conservation compliance plans. [1605]</p>	<p>House: Maximum loan of \$50,000 per producer. [1605]</p> <p>Both: Loans made or insured under Subtitle A of Title III of the Agricultural Credit Act of 1961.</p> <p>See also #'s 182-185 (Natural Resources Loan Program).</p> <p>See also # 55 in Small Community and Rural Development side-by-side.</p>

COMPARISON OF PROPOSALS FOR THE 1990 FARM BILL--AS OF AUGUST 1, 1990

	Administration	Senate	House	Comments
193) Conservation Measures on Set Aside		Sec. consults with wildlife agencies and allow producers to establish wildlife food plots, habitat. [301,...]	Same as Senate. [901,...]	
		Sec. may cost share wildlife food plots, soil and water conservation measures. [301,...]		
193a) Water Storage on Set Aside		Land converted to water storage uses acceptable if cropped in 3 of last 5 years. [301,...] Shall be acceptable cover for up to 5 years. [301,...]	Land converted to water storage uses acceptable if cropped in 3 of last 5 years, is part of a conservation plan, wetlands are not altered, and ground water usage would be reduced. [1141-1144]	House: Sec. shall devise and implement plan to provide further incentives in areas of severe ground water depletion. [1143] See also # 9.
194) Public Access to Set Aside and Other Farmlands		Sec. may provide incentive payments if producer allows public hunting or other recreational uses of farmland. [301,...]	Same as Senate. [901,...]	

COMPARISON OF PROPOSALS FOR THE 1990 FARM BILL--AS OF AUGUST 1, 1990

	Administration	Senate	House	Comments
195) Weed and Pest Control on CRP		Sec. shall provide weed and pest control guides to CRP participants. [1237] Owners subject to reduced payments if weeds not effectively controlled. [1237] ASCS, or other entity, must conduct review before payments can be reduced. [1237]		Senate: AUTHORIZES THE RENEGOTIATION OF CRP CONTRACTS IN AREAS DESIGNATED BY THE SECRETARY AS MOST LIKELY TO INCUR PEST INFESTATION. [1237]
196) Weed and Pest Control on Federal Land		REQUIRES IMPLEMENTATION OF A NATIONAL MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR WEED CONTROL ON FEDERAL LANDS. [1271-1278] PROVIDES FOR GRANTS FOR CONTROL OF NOXIOUS WEEDS, AND FOR COST SHARING WITH PRIVATE LANDOWNERS. [1277]	Amends Noxious Weed Act to require each Federal agency to designate an office or person to develop and coordinate an undesirable plant management program for Federal lands under the agency's jurisdiction. [1617]	See also # 42 in Forest Service side-by-side. See also # 61 in Marketing and Inspection Services side-by-side.
197) Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act		Amends to prohibit FmHA from making, insuring, or guaranteeing loans for manipulating wetland, or for reducing the flow, circulation, or reach of water, unless activity is for maintenance or was commenced. [1285]		Senate: Codifies current regulations.
198) Assistance for Compliance with Environmental Laws		Sec. shall, on request of producers provide technical assistance and prepare an on-farm plan. [1282]		

COMPARISON OF PROPOSALS FOR THE 1990 FARM BILL--AS OF AUGUST 1, 1990

	Administration	Senate	House	Comments
199) Outreach to Socially Disadvantaged Farmers		Sec. shall provide outreach and technical assistance to encourage and assist participation. [1236] May provide grants to colleges. [1236]	Similar to Senate. [1393] Authorizes \$10 million per year. [1393]	Senate: Section 1988 also requires review of minority participation. Both: Report shall be on a State-by-State and county-by-county basis.
		Shall report to Congress on minority participation in all conservation programs. [1236]		See also # 114.
200) Farmland Protection Policy Act		To identify quantity of farmland actually converted by Federal programs. [1241]		
201) Farmland Preservation		Sec. shall, through FmHA, provide guarantees and interest rate subsidies for loans made by lending institutions to State trust funds. [1261-1270] Guarantee limited to \$10 million per eligible State per year. [1267]	SIMILAR TO SENATE. [1618] SIMILAR TO SENATE. [1618]	Both: Sec. shall report annually concerning operation of program. Both: Program is called Agricultural Resource Conservation Demonstration Program.

COMPARISON OF PROPOSALS FOR THE 1990 FARM BILL--AS OF AUGUST 1, 1990

	Administration	Senate	House	Comments
202) Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act		<p>Allows Secretary to cost-share on flood control projects at less than 100 percent. [1251-1252]</p> <p>Sec. may provide PL-566 funds to enable project sponsors to acquire wetland easements. [1251-1254]</p> <p>Project sponsors must provide 50 percent of wetland easement cost. [1252]</p>	Adds water quality enhancement as an express purpose in plans. [1615]	Senate: Sec. shall collect and maintain data on costs and benefits. [1254]
203) Environmental Quality Offices		<p>In Research Title, creates Office of Ground Water Policy Coordination within USDA. [1436]</p> <p>Director responsible for coordinating policies within USDA and all Federal departments and agencies. [1437]</p> <p>Creates committee on Ground Water Quality to assist Director. [1438]</p>	<p>Creates Office of Environmental Quality. Director and staff, appointed by Sec., shall assist in coordination, development of policy statement, implementation of plan. [1610]</p> <p>Committee on Environmental Quality shall include the Director, heads of SCS, ASCS, APHIS, ARS, CSRS, ERS, ES, FS, FmHA, NASS. [1610]</p>	<p>House: Sec. shall request EPA, DOI, to provide liaisons, on reimbursable basis. [1610]</p> <p>House: Establishes Technical Integration Groups to coordinate with EPA, USGS, NOAA, TVA, etc. [1610]</p> <p>Both: Responsible for preparing annual reports.</p>

COMPARISON OF PROPOSALS FOR THE 1990 FARM BILL--AS OF AUGUST 1, 1990

	Administration	Senate	House	Comments
204) Technical Committees		<p>State ground water and technical support committees to coordinate ground water programs with States and agencies. [1439-1447]</p> <p>Shall review the relevance of Rural Clean Water Program projects to ground water protection programs. [1445]</p>	<p>Creates State technical committee to assist Sec. in technical considerations for implementing conservation provisions. [1606]</p> <p>Composed of professional resource managers from Federal and State agencies. [1606]</p> <p>Shall meet regularly to provide information, analysis, recommendations. [1606]</p>	<p>House: Prepares technical guides for implementation of Wetland and Wildlife Habitat Option of the Agricultural Water Quality Protection Program. Assists with HEL, Swampbuster and Compliance exemptions and appeals. [1606]</p> <p>House: No implementation or enforcement authority, however Sec. shall give strong consideration to committee recommendations. [1606]</p>
205) Resource Conservation and Development		Increases limit on eligible areas from 225 to 450. [1288]	Same as Senate. [1616]	
206) Great Plains Conservation Program	Extends to 2001 and increases authorization to \$0.9 billion.	<p>Extends to 2001 and increases authorization to \$1.2 billion. [1281]</p> <p>Calls for substitution of more intensive management practices for structural measures. [1281]</p>	Same as Administration. [1614]	Senate: Sec. shall collect and maintain data concerning consequences of assistance. [1281]

COMPARISON OF PROPOSALS FOR THE 1990 FARM BILL--AS OF AUGUST 1, 1990

	Administration	Senate	House	Comments
207) Soil and Water Activities		Requires SCS to review conservation plans for ground water concerns, prepare report for Congress, and determine whether NRI could be used for ground water assessment purposes. [1460-1461]	Sec. shall determine the impact of conservation compliance plans on water quality planning, and determine whether NRI can be used for water quality assessment purposes. [1612] Sec. shall provide annual report on SCS activities, plans, progress. [1612]	
208) Compost Use		Sec. shall conduct study of compost use, and assemble catalog of laws, rules, programs that establish standards for compost quality. [1287]	Sec. shall appoint Task Force and shall identify appropriate methods of composting agricultural wastes, and potential uses of compost. [1384]	
209) International CRP		SEC. SHALL PREPARE REPORT ON FEASIBILITY OF NEGOTIATING AN INTERNATIONAL CRP TO PROTECT FRAGILE AGRICULTURAL SOILS. [1290]		
210) Survey of Base Redistribution Desires			During "sign-up" producers complete survey regarding preferences about base redistribution, for efficiency or conservation purposes. [1120]	See also # 106.

COMPARISON OF PROPOSALS FOR THE 1990 FARM BILL--AS OF AUGUST 1, 1990

	Administration	Senate	House	Comments
211) Cleanup of Environ- mentally Contaminated Site Owned or Operated by USDA			REQUIRES SEC. TO IDENTIFY CONTAMINATION SITES, NOTIFY AFFECTED INDIVIDUALS AND PREPARE COST ESTIMATES AND WORK SCHEDULES. [1376A]	House: PROGRAM SHALL BE CARRIED OUT IN CONSULTATION WITH EPA. [1376A]
212) Resource- Conserving Crops			REQUIRES SEC. TO ALLOW UP TO 25 PERCENT OF A PRODUCER'S CROPLAND, IF IT IS HEL, TO BE PLANTED TO A RESOURCE-CONSERVING CROP AND RECEIVE DEFICIENCY PAYMENTS IF IT IS NOT HAYED OR GRAZED DURING THE 5 PRINCIPLE GROWING MONTHS. [1601]	House: SIMILAR TO GREEN BOOK 0/100 PROGRAM BUT RESTRICTED TO HEL AND 25 PERCENT OF CROPLAND.
213) End Rows Set- Aside			PRODUCERS SHALL BE ALLOWED TO PLACE END ROWS INTO ACR REGARDLESS OF MINIMUM WIDTH REQUIREMENTS. END ROW MUST BE PLANTED TO PERENNIALS AND EACH ACRE WILL COUNT AS .9 ACRES OF ACR. COUNTY COMMITTEES GIVEN AUTHORITY TO LOWER THE .9 ACRE FIGURE ON A CASE-BY-CASE BASIS. [1122]	House: SCS MUST DETERMINE THAT IT WOULD RESULT IN SUBSTANTIAL SOIL LOSS REDUCTIONS RELATIVE TO IDLING OTHER LAND. [1122] See also # 18.
214) USDA Offices on Indian Reservations		Establish a demonstration program for service to Indians by collocating ASCS, SCS, and FmHA offices at no less than 12 Indian Reservations. [1289]		See also # 64 in Small Community and Rural Development side-by- side.

COMPARISON OF PROPOSALS FOR THE 1990 FARM BILL--AS OF AUGUST 1, 1990

	Administration	Senate	House	Comments
215) National Ground Water and Wetlands Strategy		Sense of Congress that Federal agricultural policy should reflect environmental policy and concerns. [1291]		

* NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL LIBRARY



1022253673

NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL LIBRARY



1022253673